

# modern language notes

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

THE UNIVERSITY  
OF MICHIGAN

JUN 23 1961

PERIODICAL  
READING ROOM

VOL. LXXVI, NO. 5, MAY 1961

- 
- 385 Beowulfian Place Names in East Iceland. STEFÁN EINARSSON  
392 The Twenty-Nine Pilgrims and the Three Priests.  
CHARLES A. OWEN, JR.  
398 Milton and the Beasts of the Field. FRANK MANLEY  
404 The Publication of *Olor Iscanus*. JAMES D. SIMMONDS  
408 Henry Fielding's 'Lost' Law Book. WILLIAM B. COLEY  
414 A Neglected Theme in Tennyson's *In Memoriam*. J. L. KENDALL  
420 The Meaning of Browning's Ring-Figure. GEORGE R. WASSERMAN  
426 Lawrence's Non-Human Analogues. RAYMOND WRIGHT  
432 Comic Intent in Poe's Tales: Five Criteria. STEPHEN L. MOONEY  
434 Hemingway's Other Style. CHARLES R. ANDERSON  
443 The Titles of "MSS AB." WILLIAM J. STEVENS  
445 Stendhal, Shakespeare and a Fool's Fall. JULES C. ALCIATORE  
445 Renan et la Légèreté Française. MICHEL GUGGENHEIM  
454 Notes on the Etymology of *Serendipity* and Some Related Philo-  
logical Observations. LEO A. GOODMAN

## REVIEWS

- 458 WILLIAM J. PAFF, *The Geographical and Ethnic Names in the þiðriks Saga: A Study in Germanic Heroic Legend* (STEFÁN EINARSSON)
- 460 CHRISTOPHER TOLKIEN, ed., *The Saga of King Heiðrek the Wise* (STEFÁN EINARSSON)
- 462 RONALD PAULSON, *Theme and Structure in Swift's Tale of a Tub* (SHERMAN HAWKINS)
- 464 MARTIN C. BATTISTIN, *The Moral Basis of Fielding's Art: A Study of Joseph Andrews* (JESSIE RHODES CHAMBERS)
- 467 G. A. MAYER, *La Religion de Marot* (MARCEL FRANÇON)
- 473 ALBERT A. SICROFF, *Les Controverses des statuts de "pureté de sang" en Espagne du XV<sup>e</sup> au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (KENNETH R. SCHOLBERG)
- 477 ERNEST HATCH WILKINS, *Petrarch's Eight Years in Milan*, ERNEST H. WILKINS, *Petrarch's Later Years* (ALDO S. BERNARDO)

---

## modern language notes

BRUCE W. WARDROPPER,

*General Editor*

HENRY HORNIK,

*Managing Assistant*

DON CAMERON ALLEN  
CHARLES R. ANDERSON  
NATHAN EDELMAN  
STEFÁN EINARSSON  
JOHN FRECCERO  
RENÉ N. GIRARD  
J. LIONEL GOSSMAN  
RICHARD H. GREEN  
ANNA G. HATCHER  
HAROLD JANTZ  
WILLIAM H. McCLAIN  
J. HILLIS MILLER  
LAWRENCE J. ROSS  
CHARLES S. SINGLETON  
EARL R. WASSERMAN

Published eight times annually, November through June. Subscription: \$8.00 in the United States; \$9.00 in Canada; \$8.50 in other countries. Single issue, \$1.00. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Md. Claims for replacement of missing numbers must be received within 3 months (6 months in the case of foreign subscribers) following publication of the number.

Contributors and publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to *Modern Language Notes*, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped return envelope. In preparing manuscripts, contributors are requested to follow the MLA Style Sheet.

Second-class postage paid at Baltimore, Maryland.

State  
ON)  
KIN  
from

e  
ards

thre  
s; \$2  
e, \$10  
s sh  
18, M  
must  
e of  
num  
usca  
es, D  
E  
l re  
tors  
nd.

n  
l  
r

B

ab  
th  
B  
fir  
In

co  
th  
(  
19  
S  
fr

pl  
S  
A  
sc  
A  
th  
B

w



# modern language notes

VOL. LXXVI, NO. 5, MAY 1961

805  
m84  
L3n

## Beowulfian Place Names in East Iceland

In *Modern Language Notes* 1956 (LXXI, 79-82) I wrote a note about two place names, *Bjölfur* and *Grendill* in the East of Iceland, the first well known and to be traced back to a name of a settler, *Bjólfr*, mentioned in *Landnámabók*, the second appearing for the first time on the maps of the Danish General Staff and the Geodetic Institute of Copenhagen in 1944.

In the summer of 1954 I travelled through the East of Iceland to collect materials for a local description of these parts, published by the Icelandic Tourist Society, the southern part in the yearbook (*Árbók Ferðafélagsins*) 1955, the northern part in the yearbook 1957. In the summer of 1957 I had a grant from the Philosophical Society at Philadelphia to collect all place names in the East Fjords from Álftafjörður to Borgarfjörður both fjords included.

As I stated in my 1956 paper, the mountain peak *Grendill* was photographed and mapped by the late and lamented Icelandic scientist Steinþór Sigurðsson (d. 1947) and his picture was printed in *Árbók Ferðafélagsins* 1937 page 73 below. This promising young scientist was killed by a lava block from the eruption of Hekla 1947. Assuming that he was responsible for the name *Grendill*, I thought that he might have gotten it from Jón Sigfússon, farmer at Bragðavellir (d. 1952) where the now famous Roman coins were

found. I thought the name might have belonged to the place names of Víðidalur, since it was not known by any one that I could get hold of in Lón, especially not Sigurður Jónsson, the learned farmer of the parsonage Stafafell, son of the even more learned parson and writer, Jón Jónsson, author of *Víkingasaga* and many learned articles on Old Icelandic language and literature. Naturally I trusted Sigurður Jónsson best to know everything about place names in Lón.

In the summer of 1957 I thought I might get this hypothesis confirmed when I talked to the farmer Helgi Einarsson at Melrakkanes. He had for nine years in his teens lived in Víðidalur with Jón Sigfússon and his father Sigfús Jónsson, both great singers and chanters of *rímur*. Helgi had a specimen of *Svoldar-rímur* which had been written up by one of the two, and Helgi had learned not only the *rímur* tunes used by father and son but also a very old-fashioned hymn melody to *Veróníku-kvæði* sung by some of the old ladies of the place. And, as a matter of fact, Helgi also knew, and quite naturally, all the place names of Víðidalur; I copied them, and they are now in the Icelandic Þjóðmenjasafn (The National Museum)—but *Grendill* was not among them.

But then, all of a sudden, there seemed to be coming some new light on *Grendill*. There was a report from Vernharður Þorsteinsson (1884-1959), teacher at the gymnasium of Akureyri that the place name had probably been collected by him in Lón during the Summer 1935 or 1936. He had the task of going ahead of the Danish surveyors and collect the place names while a certain young man with the surveyors entered the place names on their maps. Vernharður's list should be preserved at the Roads Surveyors Bureau (Vegamálastofan) in Reykjavík for Vernharður claims to have sent his material there. He felt the name *Grendill* was familiar to himself; he had a vague idea that a troll story was connected with it in Lón, but could not remember whether he had read it in *Beowulf*. However, Dr. Med. Bjarni Rafnar, an old student of the Gymnasium, Akureyri, has told me that *Grendill* was mentioned in *Ágrip af forníslenzkri bókmenntasögu* by Sigurður Guðmundsson and that the pupils made a facetious verse about the monster. This Vernharður must have known. He was an educated man: he was graduated from the Reykjavík Gymnasium in 1906, became cand. phil. at the University of Copenhagen 1907 and studied philosophy there until 1914. After that he was a journalist and writer in Germany, Switzerland, and Norway until 1921, when he returned to Akureyri, Iceland to teach at the High School there, later

the Gymnasium. He was an emeritus from that school in 1957 but died 1959.

Vernharður got most of his place names in Lón from the farmer Jón Eriksson in Volasel and also from a certain young man in Hvammur, whose name he did not remember nor whether he was a farmer or a farmhand. Thus far Vernharður Þorsteinsson.

I wrote to Stefán Jónsson in Hlíð, sheriff in Lón, and like Sigurður Jónsson at Stafafell, an extremely knowledgeable man. His inquiries led to precisely nothing. He talked to Jón on Volasel, now in Höfn, Hornafjörður, and got a negative answer: no knowledge of *Grendill*. And no one else in Lón seemed to know. So until further information that seems to be the end of *Grendill* as an old or even young place name in the East of Iceland.

In my paper of 1952 I listed *grindill*, "wind storm," as the nearest parallel to *Grendill* in Old Icelandic. Both could be ablaut stages of a Germanic verb \**grindan*, \**grand*, \**grundum*, \**grundanaz*; *grendill* would be from \**grandilaz*. Icelandic *grand* means harm, "damage." The thula from which *grindill* is taken is printed by Finnur Jónsson in his *Den norsk-islandske Skjaldedigtning* A, I Vol. p. 683 diplomatically and B, I Vol. p. 674 in normalized edition. Since the fragment seems rarely to be included with editions of *Snorra Edda* as it is only an accretion to the work, I thought it advisable to print it here in its normalized form.

Veðra heiti

Veðr, byrr vönsuðr,  
vindr, élreki,  
glygg, blær ok gustr,  
gráp, logn, þoka,  
regn, úr, rota,  
rið, myrkvi, él,  
fjúk, fok, mugga,  
frost, kári, hregg,

Gönsuðr, gráði,  
gol, ofviðri,  
gjósta, grindill,  
gæla ok óhljóðr,  
gneggjuðr, gönsuðr.  
gæ, dynfari,  
hlömmuðr, ganrekr,  
húsbrjótr ok þjótr.

But in addition to this weather term there is a place name *Grindill* in Iceland, already listed in *Landnámabók*, Finnur Jónsson's edition København 1900, *Hauksbók* p. 70, *Sturlubók* p. 191; here is an excerpt from *Hauksbók* with variants from *Sturlubók*:

Þórðr knappr hét maðr svenskr[sygnskr] systur son [son] Bjarnar at Haugi, en annar hét Nafar-Helgi. Þeir . . . kómu við Haganes. Þórðr nam land upp frá Stíflu til Tunguár ok bjó á Knappstöðum . . . Nafar-Helgi nam land fyrir austan upp frá Haganesi til Flókdalsár fyrir neðan Barð ok upp til Tunguár ok bjó á Grindli. Hann átti Gró ena skyggnu [snarskyggnu].

In his article on Icelandic farm names in *Safn til sögu Íslands* IV, 572. Finnur Jónsson does connect this *Grindill* with *Beowulf's Grendel*. He also mentions *Grillir* in Húnavatnssýsla and *Grulla* in Árnessýsla.

Strangely enough Kaalund does not mention *Grindill* in his *Bidrag til topografisk Beskrivelse af Island* (Köbenhavn 1882) though Björn Gunnlaugsson has it on his map, published by Kaalund in his book.

But it is found in J. Johnsen, *Jarðatal á Íslandi* Kaupmannahöfn 1817 p. 274, both *Grindill* and *Minni Grindill*, the first farm estimated to be 20 hundred "á landsvísu" the second 10 hundred. It is also found, but under a strangely changed name in *Jarðabók Árna Magnússonar*, ed. by Jakob Benediktsson, Vol. IX, pp. 308-309.

The name there is *Grillir*, *Stóri* and *Minni*. But the editor remarks that the name is originally written *Grijndle* which A. M. has crossed out and written *Griller* in the margin. Now *Grijndle* looks like the original *Landnáma* form "á Grindli" which one would expect to be in normal use even in the seventeenth century, but the spelling *ij* indicates the long vowel *í* rather than the short *i*. *Grillir* is quite mysterious unless the dative form "á Grindli" was assimilated to *Grilli*; then the nominative should be *Grillir*. The name was quite unique, hence changes could be expected.

In *Árbók Ferðafélagsins* 1946, p. 97, a description of Skagafjörður by Hallgrímur Jónasson the estate *Grindill* in Fljót is mentioned as a property going back to the age of settlement, but described in no way. If the name should mean storm, there is a *Veðramót* "meeting of weathers" not far away.

The connections of *Grindill* "storm" and *Grindill* "an estate in Fljót, Skagafjörður" seem too far removed from *Beowulf's Grendel* to interest us—with our present knowledge or understanding of these names, which is practically nil. The element *Grind-* is often found in Norwegian farm names.

But there are certain farm names in Fljótsdalshérað which might have some Beowulfian or English overtones. A group of them is found in Eiðapinghá and Hjaltastaðapinghá less than a day's journey by foot or horse from Seyðisfjörður, settled by Bjólfr according to *Landnámabók*. One more is found in Fljótsdalur, a day's journey to the south.

In Hjaltastaðapinghá there is *Hrjótur* and *Jórvík*, in Eiðapinghá *Hjartarstaðir* and *Hleinargarður* (older *Hleiðrargarður*). A day's ride towards the South there is *Valþjófsstaður* in Fljótsdalur. A

Valþjófr and Valþjófsstaðir is mentioned in *Landnáma*, but in the West of Iceland, not here. In any case the name Valþjófur must be the same as Wealhþeow in *Beowulf*. None of the other place names is found in *Landnáma*, except *Hleiðrargarðr*, located in Eyjafjörðr, not here.

Two of the above names, *Hleiðrargarður* and *Jórvík* belong to a group of place names in Iceland which might be called Snob-names (Germ. *Prunknamen*) and have been treated by Hans Kuhn in "Birka auf Island" (*Namn och Bygd* 1949, XXXVII, pp. 47-64). These are names of towns famous at the time of the settlement or after, like *Sigtúnir* and *Uppsälir* in Sweden, *Hleiðrargarðr* and *Heiðabær* in Denmark, *Jórvík* and *Sandvík* in England, *Hlaðir* in Norway, *Garðar* in Russia, *Mikligarðr*, capital of the East Roman Empire.

Kuhn finds only three of these names in the East of Iceland (Austfirðingafjórðungr), our *Jórvík*, our *Hleinargarðr* (but spelled *Hleiðrargarðr* in *Diplomatarium Islandicum* III, 239 f. and IV, 221, 224) and *Uppsälir*, also in Eiðabínghá. *Jórvík* is also found in Breiðdalur in the East as well as in Álftaver, Vestur Skaftafellssýsla. When writing about the place names of Breiðdalur (in *Breiðdala*, Reykjavík 1948) I found two other names which might have connections with the British Isles. One was *Ásunnarstaðir*, often pronounced *Ásunastaðir*, and if so could be from \**Ásuni* comparable to O. E. *Oswine*. The other name was *Butralda-kíll*, "the Run of Butraldi." Kemp Malone helped me to derive the name Butraldi from Irish *Putrall* or *Purtall*, "a mop of hair," a very apt nickname, comparable to the O. Icel. *lúfa*. The name first occurs as a personal name, Butraldi in *Fóstbrœðra saga* as well as in *Butraldabrekka*, where this character met his well deserved death. *Butraldastaðir* also occurs as a farm name with a shortening like *Butra*.

The peculiar thing about *Butralda-kíll*, which probably means "the Run in which Butraldi was drowned," is that it occurs not only in Breiðdalur but also in Tjarnarland, Hjaltastaðabínghá and in both placed it in an extremely dangerous water course for domestic animals, especially sheep, when frozen and thawing up.

Let us now return to the names *Hrjótur*, *Hjartarstaðir*, *Hleiðrargarður* and, perhaps, *Valþjófsstaðir* and see what Kemp Malone has to say about similar names in *Beowulf* and Saxo. *Hleiðrargarður* is, of course, to be identified with *Hleiðra*—the famous seat of the Scyldings in Sjælland, Denmark. As to *Valþjófr* and *Wealhþeow*,

the name must be the same, though *-þjófr* means "a thief" and *-þeow* "a slave or servant," just as O.E. *Onganþeow* must be O. Icel. *Angantýr*, though that correspondence is closer, and *Valtýr* does occur. Malone thinks that *Wealhþeow* must originally have been used about Yrsa whom he by emendation assumes to have been the queen of Onela of *Beowulf*. She is well known in Scandinavian sources. In *Hrólfs saga Kraka* she is Hrólfr's mother and sister, and the wife and daughter of Helgi, his father. For the other names, here mentioned, it is best for our purpose to copy a passage from Malone's paper on "The Daughter of Healfdene" in his *Studies in Heroic Legend and in Current Speech* (1959 pp. 135 ff.):

"The *Beowulf* poet refers to the daughter of Hroðgar as *Freawaru*, but this was hardly her actual name. When we turn to the Scandian accounts, we find the corresponding character in the Hrólfr cycle bearing the name *Hrút* [Saxo: *Ruta*] while in the Ingjaldr cycle she is left nameless. The historicity of *Hrút* can hardly be questioned, since it is a name actually used in Scandia in historic times, alliterates with the names of the other Scyldings and appears in the *Bjarkamál* itself, the oldest Scandian poem that deals with the Scyldings. The English poet either did not remember the name of Hroðgar's daughter, or else he did not like the name. At any rate he gives her a name high-sounding enough for any princess.

The reason for the English poet's dislike of *Hrút* (if we suppose that he knew the name) must be sought not so much in the true etymology of the word as in the associations the word would have for an Englishman. In Icelandic the corresponding masculine form, *Hrútr*, is used not only as a proper name, but also as a common noun, in the sense of 'ram.' No such word occurs in English, however, and we may be sure that the lady's name was not associated with a sheep in the mind of the English poet. There seems to have existed in O.E. an adjective *hrút* 'dark-colored,' it is a rare word and can hardly have influenced our poet. He much more probably associated the name with the O.E. verb *hrútan* 'snore.' [In Icelandic the verb meaning this is *hrjóta*, *hraut* but one can also facetiously say: *skera hrúta* 'to cut rams.' Perhaps the O.E. *hrútan* is an aorist present corresponding to *hrjóta* like Icel. *lúka* and *ljúka* S. E.]. Manifestly a name with such an association would be highly objectionable in heroic poetry and none would blame the poet for discarding it and substituting a fine word like *Freawaru*.

Turning to the actual etymology of *Hrút*, we find that it goes back to a Germanic base *\*herut-* which gives O.E. *heorot* 'hart' [Icel. *hjörtr* in *Hjartar-staðir*], on the one hand, and (with nilgrade of the *e*) Icelandic *hrútr* 'ram' [and perhaps *Hrjótur* place name] on the other. Compare Greek *κόρυδος* 'crested lark.' It would appear that the animals involved were named after the protuberances on their heads (horns or crests) [the place from its rocks?]. Has it any significance that Hrothgar named his hall *Heorot* and his daughter *Hrút*? Certainly *Heorot* with its initial *h* is characteristic for the Scylding dynasty and one cannot dismiss the possibility that *Hrút* goes back to a noun, not preserved to us, which meant doe. But here we enter the realm of speculation." So far Malone.



I am afraid we, too, would have to enter the realm of speculation in trying to connect the hall *Heorot* with the farm name *Hrjótur* not least so since neither name is otherwise found in Icelandic or Scandinavian sources. Obviously the easiest way out would be for us to consider *Hrjótur* to be of the same type as the proven snob-name *Hleiðrargarður*. We would then have to assume that *Heorot*, the hall, was as well known in Scandinavia as *Hleiðra* the town and *Birka* the town. The names are, of course, not the same—though *Hjörtr* in *Hjartar-staðir* is the personal name which would correspond to *Heorot*. But while *Hjartar-staðir* represents an extremely common and well known type of place name, *Hrjótr* seems to be quite unique in Iceland. If it is actually an attempt to reproduce the Danish or Beowulfian *Heorot*, the hall name, the difference might not be greater nor more significant than things which happen to some of the heroic names, like O. E. *Wealhþeow* and O. Icel. *Valþjófr*, O. E. *Hliðe*, O. Icel. *Hlöðr* or O. E. *Hemming*, O. Icel. *Höfundr*.

But if we assumed that the name of the famous hall in Denmark was actually *Hrjótr* rather than *Heorot* or *Hjörtr* we would get a name whose etymology was obviously much closer to that of the lady *Hrút* than the O. E. word. Since O. E. *hrútan* and O. Icel. *hrjóta* both meaning "to snore," can neither be separated from each other nor from the Danish lady *Hrút* it would seem preferable to take that meaning as basic. One might then also compare the Odin's name *Hrjótr* which Jan de Vries, *Altgermanische Religions-geschichte* (1957) p. 353 lists with wind names: *Sviðrir*, *Viðrir*, *Váfuðr*, *Geiguðr*, *Hrjótr*. According to Snorri's *Heimskringla* the *Skjöldungar* were descended from Odin so that such a name would seem to be in the family. The other meaning of *hrjóta* "fly, be flung" might perhaps be used to explain the Icelandic place name, if it is a place where the rocks look as if they had been flung into place—or as if the snow had been blown away from them—the farm is full of rocks, like many Icelandic places. Unless it means a place "crested with rocks."

There is evidence that *Hrjótur* was not an ordinary farmstead but an assembly place (*þingstaður*). This is probably the site of *Lambanessþing*, mentioned in *Droplaugarsona saga* (*Íslenzk Fornrit*, XI, 168). If so, it was situated at the north end of *Hrjótarvatn* where there are many *búðar-tóttir* (booth ruins) called *Lambatættur*, perhaps because the place was used as night enclosure for lambs. Cf. an article on *Lambaness-þing* by Kristján Jónsson frá Hrjót, *Árbók fornleifafélagsins* 1925, 34-41.

If *Hleiðrargarðr* and *Hrjótr* are two Danish snob-names in Fljótsdalshérað it would help if we knew that the countryside was settled by Danish settlers. We *do* have such evidence in *Landnámabók*:

"Uni the Danish or unborn [caesarian?], the son of Garðarr, who found Iceland, went to Iceland by the counsel of King Harold the Hair-fair and intended to subjugate the country; after that the King had promised to make him his earl. Uni took land where now is called Unaóss and built houses there. He appropriated the land south (=east) of Lagarfljót, the whole countryside [south] to Unalækr.

But when the people of the country knew his intent, they began to get ruffled with him and would neither sell him livestock nor food, so that he could not stay there. Uni went away and came into South Alftafjörðr; but he could not settle down there. He went from the East with twelve men and came in the beginning of the winter [or after a winter] to Leiðólfr the Champion in Skógahverfi; he received them. Uni loved Þórunn, daughter of Leiðólfr; she was pregnant in the spring. Then Uni wanted to run away with his men, but Leiðólfr rode after him; they met at Flangastaðir and fought; for Uni did not want to return with Leiðólfr. There fell some of Uni's men and he went back against his will, for Leiðólfr wanted him to come back, marry the woman, settle down, and take his inheritance after him. A little later Uni ran away again when Leiðólfr was not at home; but as soon as he knew, Leiðólfr rode after him; they met at Kálfaðrafir. He was then so mad that he killed Uni and all his companions.

The son of Uni and Þórunn was Hróarr [Hróðgar] Tungugoði [the priest of Tunga] he took the whole inheritance of Leiðólfr and was a great warrior."

It is interesting to observe that Uni should call his son Hróarr, a name straight out of the royal Danish family of the Scyldings. The story, from our point of view, has the drawback that Uni, with all his men, was chased out of the East and it is, of course, idle to guess in what way the Danish snob-names are connected with him and his men.

There are twenty-seven *Hróð* personal names in *Landnámabók*, no doubt all connected with the same royal family. See Barði Guðmundsson, *Uppruni Íslendinga*, Reykjavík, 1959, pp. 191-192.

The Johns Hopkins University

STEFAN EINARSSON

## The Twenty-Nine Pilgrims and the Three Priests

Efforts to account for the number of pilgrims Chaucer actually mentions in the *Prologue* to the *Canterbury Tales* take generally one of two directions. Either the nine-and-twenty of line 24 is found to



be a general number representing simply a great many.<sup>1</sup> Or the "preestes thre" of line 164 is discounted. By some it is regarded as a scribal interpolation.<sup>2</sup> By others it is interpreted as meaning a single priest who makes a total of three after the analogy of such lines as the following in the *Friar's Tale*:

Both hey and cart, and eek his caples thre (D1554)

where the hay and the cart and the horses (two) each make a unit in the total count of three.<sup>3</sup> The difficulty here is with the plural form "preestes." Certainly the meaning that Chaucer's readers would most naturally have understood in the line was that there were really three priests. Professor W. W. Lawrence in his book, *Chaucer and the Canterbury Tales*, thinks that there were three priests and accepts Carleton Brown's suggestion that the portrait of the Squire was interpolated between those of the Knight and the Yeoman. Before the addition of the Squire, he points out, the number of pilgrims Chaucer met at the Tabard was exactly twenty-nine. "Forgetfulness on Chaucer's part" is then assumed to account for there being only one Nun's Priest when the Host calls on him for a tale (B3999).<sup>4</sup>

Possibilities for a better explanation lie, I think, in a study of the grouping of the pilgrims. The Knight's group of three, representing among the pilgrims the military life, was to be followed by the Prioress's of five, representing the religious, and the fact that the Prioress was followed by a retinue so much larger than the Knight's was to be an element in the characterization of each:

A Yeman hadde he, and servantz namo  
At that tyme, for hym liste ride so. (A102)

But when Chaucer was linking the tales of section B2, he had appar-

<sup>1</sup> See for instance Eleanor Hammond, *Chaucer, A Bibliography* (London, 1908), p. 255, and Hinckley, *Notes on Chaucer* (Northampton, Mass.), 1907, p. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Skeat, *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Oxford, 1894), III, pp. 380, 388; v, p. 19; and Robinson, *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Cambridge, Mass., 1957), p. 655. See also Miss Rickert's suggestion: *Text of the Canterbury Tales* (Chicago, 1940), III, p. 423.

<sup>3</sup> W. P. Lehman, *MLN*, LXVII (1952), 317 ff. Professor Lehman's reading of the line in the *Friar's Tale* is that the hay and the cart make one item and the two horses make up the total of three. Professor Leo Spitzer in *MLN*, LXVII (1952), 502, will not accept her (not his) explanation, but suggests for his own part that preestes is a genitive singular.

<sup>4</sup> (New York, 1950), pp. 44-46. For a complete bibliography to 1945 on the subject see the Wells *Manual* and its supplements, Chapter XVI, Section 54. Miss Bowden in *A Commentary on the General Prologue* (New York, 1949), accepts the Skeat-Manly-Robinson explanation: p. 43, footnote 58; and p. 104.

ently decided against this element of contrast, for it is *the Nun's Priest* who tells the final tale. At the same time he was adding, I would suggest, the Monk and the Friar to the number of pilgrims. The religious group, then, would still consist of five pilgrims, and the greater variety would facilitate the keeping of the storytellers distinct from one another. Furthermore, the total of pilgrims would still add up to 29, if we include Chaucer in the number.<sup>5</sup>

Chaucer realized the advantages of grouping the pilgrims and used considerable variety in the rationale behind the groups. Only five of the pilgrims, in series of two and three, are treated as entirely separate from the others. At the same time he seems to have realized that groups of more than five would be difficult to remember and so would defeat the purpose for which they were formed. Hence his final arrangement of the pilgrims as follows:

- 3 Knight, Squire, Yeoman (Father, son, and retainer)
- 3 + 2 Prioress, Nun, Priest (traveling under the Prioress); Monk; Friar  
(the five forming a religious group)
- 1; 1 Merchant; Clerk
- 2 Man of Law, Franklin (traveling companions)
- 5 + 1 Guildsmen and Cook
- 1; 1; 1 Shipman; Physician; Wife of Bath
- 2 Parson, Ploughman (brothers)
- 5 + 1 Churls and Chaucer (within this group, Summoner and Pardoner are traveling companions).

Other considerations, of which we can be reasonable confident, lend support to the theory of the replacement of the two priests by the Monk and the Friar. Mrs. Dempster presented evidence for the close relationship in time of the B2 fragment and the marriage group.<sup>6</sup> Hence, when the Nun's Priest was being assigned his tale, the Monk in B2 and the Friar in D immediately following the *Wife of Bath's Tale* were being similarly provided. Furthermore, the strong attack on corruption associated with the church, indirectly made in the description of the Parson, is carried home directly in the tales of the Friar and the Summoner, in the confession of the Pardoner (associated by its echoes of the "Parson's Tale" with the *Wife of Bath*

<sup>5</sup> Skeat comments on the ambiguity of Chaucer's association with the pilgrims, op. cit., III, p. 388. At first Chaucer seems to be saying that he met twenty-nine pilgrims at the Tabard. But before he describes the process of getting acquainted with them, *they* have become *we* (A 29), and of course he adds himself in at the end of the list (A 544). O. F. Emerson [*PQ* II (1923), 89 ff.] in a consideration of the grouping thinks that Chaucer intended the three priests to apply to the Nun's Priest, the Friar, and the Monk.

<sup>6</sup> Germaine Dempster, *PMLA*, LXVIII (1953), 1142-1159.

and the Merchant), and in the portraits of the Monk, the Friar, the Summoner, and the Pardoner (for the last two we shall see below some reason to assign a late composition).<sup>7</sup> Finally, the portraits of the Monk and the Friar, linked as they are by rhyme and hence probably composed at the same time, are among the most complex of the descriptions in the *Prologue*, especially in the use of indirect discourse to catch and expose the very accent of the casuistry with which these pilgrims justify their misconduct.

Two questions remain: Why did Chaucer not change the line with the three priests in it? No doubt he would have changed it when he got around to composing the portraits of the Second Nun and the Nun's Priest. But there was no reason to revise a line which in any event he would eventually have to replace. The inconsistencies of the *Canterbury Tales* and the uncertain state of the order of tales suggest a sudden and incapacitating final illness for Chaucer. The three priests were simply another of the inconsistencies he didn't live to correct.

The other question is more difficult. Why are the Friar's and the Merchant's portraits connected by rhyme? The description of the Merchant contains the reference to the sea-route between Orwell and Middelburgh, which seems to mark it as belonging to the limited period when the Staple was at Middelburgh, 1384-1388, the last two years of this period representing the earliest of Chaucer's work on the *Canterbury Tales*. The addition of the Monk and the Friar, if it occurred at the time of Chaucer's linking of the stories in B2 and in the Marriage Group, would belong to the period around 1396. Of course, Chaucer could have been looking back at conditions in the year 1387 as he composed the portraits of the Monk, the Friar, and the Merchant. But such an explanation is too convenient, there being no other reason than the rhyme to associate the description of the Merchant with those of the Monk and the Friar. Rather it seems likely that the Merchant's portrait was one of the early ones. How then to account for the rhyme Huberd-berd? The three priests of the early

<sup>7</sup> Miss Eleanor Hammond suggested that the five pilgrims in the list at the end were an afterthought (op. cit., p. 254). She also felt that there was considerable evidence for the theory that the *Prologue* was not "*aus einem Guss*"; that the Tales of the Miller, the Reeve, the Summoner, and the Friar must have been conceived at the same time that the characters were created; and that the Merchant's Tale (in her view even later than those just mentioned) was forced on the pilgrim. (She apparently did not notice the difficulty we take up later in the rhyme Huberd-berd.) She comments on social satire as the partial intention of the fabliau tales, pp. 254-256.

plan for the pilgrimage would have been indistinguishable without names, and in fact we find that the Host, when he calls on *the* Nun's Priest for a tale, calls him by name, Sir John. A line could originally have followed the reference to "preestes thre," running somewhat as follows:

Cleped Sir John, Sir Piers and Sir Huberd. (f A 164)

When the Monk and the Friar replaced two of the priests, the rhyme for the Merchant's "berd" would have required the transfer of the name Huberd to the end of the Friar's portrait. Hence the anomaly of the Friar's name:

This worthy lymytour was cleped Huberd. (A 269)

The only other character named in the Prologue is the Prioress; and Madame Eglentyne not only occurs near the beginning of the portrait but has considerable value as characterization. An already completed portrait of the Merchant needing a rhyme for "berd" seems the best explanation for the rather weak afterthought of the Friar's name, which Chaucer never mentions again. And the need for the rhyme word by the completed portrait must have resulted from a disrupted earlier sequence.

If this explanation is correct, and the three priests were once named and joined by rhyme to the portrait of the Merchant, it would indicate that Chaucer did not originally intend to include descriptions of all the pilgrims in the *Prologue*. Such a conclusion inevitably directs attention to another list, joined by rhyme to the Ploughman's portrait and ending with a degree of finality that makes the following portraits something of a surprise.

Ther was also a Reve and a Millere  
A Somnour, and a Pardoner also,  
A Maunciple, and myself — ther were namo. (A 544)

Chaucer's original plan for the *Prologue* involved perhaps the shorter series of fifteen portraits, with some of the pilgrims described fully, the five guildsmen drawn in a group picture, and some simply named. With the substitution of the Monk and the Friar for two of the priests, Chaucer decided to furnish portraits of all of the pilgrims. He left the list of churls because he didn't complete all the descriptions at once, because the list provided the rhyme for the final line of the Ploughman's portrait, and because, as Professor Malone suggested, the list performed the function of telling his readers when they had long since lost count that there were only five to go. Chaucer also left the

line with the three priests unchanged because he realized that he would be altering it anyway when he composed the descriptions of the Second Nun and the Nun's Priest. The motivation for the addition of nine portraits to a "clause" (A 714) already long was at least two-fold—Chaucer's recognition of the interaction between character and tale as the energizing principle of his general scheme, and his growing interest in the lower orders as he worked on the fabliaux and the confessions of Wife of Bath and Pardoner.

The theory for the development of the *Prologue* suggested in the article can be summarized as follows:

I. 1387-1388(?): Portraits of 14 of the pilgrims and the joint portrait of the five guildsmen were composed (with the Squire's probably inserted between the Knight's and the Yeoman's); the Nun, the three priests, and the five churls were simply listed without being described, the priests being differentiated from one another by name. Rhymes connected the Yeoman and the Prioress, the names of the priests and the Merchant, the Cook and the Shipman, and the Ploughman and the list of churls.

II. Period around 1396: Chaucer substituted the Monk and the Friar for two of the priests, composed their portraits (linked by rhyme) and inserted them in the appropriate place, using the name of the third priest for the Friar in order to preserve the rhyme Huberd-berd, but leaving the line mentioning the three priests to be altered when he composed portraits of the Nun and the Nun's Priest. During this period he was also writing the descriptions of the five churls. It was probably in this period that he composed the introductory lines for the portraits (A 35-42), in which he says he is going to tell us about each of the pilgrims.<sup>8</sup>

University of Connecticut,  
Storrs, Connecticut

CHARLES A. OWEN, JR.

<sup>8</sup> Compare this outline with the one given for the development of the *Canterbury Tales* in *JEGP*, LVII (1958), 464. The changes and additions posited for II here would belong to the period there designated as 3, the period when Chaucer resumed work on the *Canterbury Tales* after a lapse of several years, but before his expansion of the plan to four tales for each pilgrim.

## Milton and the Beasts of the Field

Milton's account of the creation of the land animals in the seventh book of *Paradise Lost* (449-498) is apparently a vague, poetic gesture evoking an equally vague sense of immensity. In reading it, instead of paying strict attention to what is actually being said, we presumably allow ourselves to drift with the verse, using it as raw material for the indefinite and therefore vast creations of our own visual imaginations. Milton describes a few representative species breaking the surface of the teeming earth, and we get the general idea and fill in the rest for ourselves. The poetry acts mainly as stimulus, and there is nothing wrong with that. It is a legitimate effect. But at the same time there is something more to it. The lines are not only centrifugal; they are also centripetal. For each of the animals Milton mentions was not simply chosen at random; it was selected precisely with an eye to centuries of exegetical tradition. Almost every one of them posed simply by its presence a particular problem in the mechanics of creation that had exercised the faith and ingenuity of commentators ever since the earliest days of the church and which in the Renaissance had become particularly pressing as faith gave way to science. Now that the process is complete and our mental zoos are stuffed with odder mutations than the *allopecopithicum*, no one is likely to know much about the controversy, except perhaps someone like Stephen Daedalus:

A louse crawled over the nape of his neck and, putting his thumb and fore-finger deftly beneath his loose collar, he caught it. . . . There came to his mind a curious phrase from Cornelius a Lapide which said that the lice born of human sweat were not created by God with the other animals on the sixth day.<sup>1</sup>

Milton begins appropriately with the lion, the primate of beasts, and mentions in rapid succession a series of other felines:

the Ounce,  
The Libbard, and the Tiger, as the Mole  
Rising, the crumbl'd Earth above them threw  
In Hillocks. (466-469)

The trouble is with the ounce and the leopard. As the name implies, the leopard was traditionally believed to have come from the cross-breeding of lions (*leo*) and panthers (*pardus*); and the ounce, a

<sup>1</sup> James Joyce, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (New York, 1956), p. 234.



form of lynx, somewhat more incongruously from wolves and deer. But if they were crossbreeds, the problem arises, when were they created, directly by God in the beginning, or did they come along later by themselves through some sort of confusion or degeneration of the species? In Milton's time opinion was somewhat divided. The greatest of all Renaissance commentators on *Genesis*, Benedictus Pererius, held with initial creation; he saw nothing unnatural about them:

censeo equidem istiusmodi generationem animalium [i.e., "mulus, ex aqua, & asino, ex hirco, & oue Tityrus, ex Leena, & Pardo Leopardus, ex Lupo, & Cerua lynx"] naturalem esse, cum fermè omnia quae ad eam perficiendam conueniunt sint naturalia, hoc est, materia, vnde generantur, efficiens causa, locus, tempus, appetitus, conuenientia naturalis inter mares, & foeminas, denique nobilitas eiusmodi animalium, quae perfectissimis vel paria vel proxima sunt.<sup>2</sup>

But that was a minority opinion. Most Renaissance commentators agreed with Ambrose<sup>3</sup> and Rupertus<sup>4</sup> that crossbreeds were a kind of degenerate, a direct result of the unnatural lust and disorder that entered the world through original sin. And they had compelling, almost overwhelming arguments to prove it:

1. Deus voluit terram producere animantia לַמִּינֵהוּ secundum speciem suam i.e. sibi similia & homogenea. 2. Confusio specierum expresse prohibetur, *Lev.* 19. *vers.* 19. . . . 3. Heterogeneae hujus faeturae origio ostentitur, *Gen.* 36. 24. Ubi Anan dicitur inuenisse יָמִיִם i.e. omnium Interpretum consensu, mulos. 4. In Africa novae indies oriuntur species. 5. Haec ipsa ἐρεργόγεια & confusio videtur poena peccati, & species illius ματομόγητος, cui propter peccatum subjecta est creatura. 6. Haec inversio Naturae est principium . . . Magiae, quae, Iudaeis iudiciis, nihil aliud est, quam detorsio creaturatum a legitimo usu.<sup>5</sup>

Another difficulty was with the amphibians, Milton's "River Horse and scaly Crocodile," "ambiguous between Sea and Land" (474, 473). The problem was simply this: if they were true amphibians, equally at home on land as in the water, then when were they created, on the sixth day with the land animals, or on the fifth with the fish,

<sup>2</sup> *Commentariorum et Disputationum in Genesim* (Venetiis, 1607), p. 58.

<sup>3</sup> *Hexameron*, PL 14, 258.

<sup>4</sup> *De Trinitate*, PL 167, 246.

<sup>5</sup> J. H. Hottinger, ΚΤΙΣΙΣ ΕΞΑΗΜΕΡΟΣ: *Id est: Historiae Creationis Examen* (Heidelbergae, 1659), pp. 228-229. An almost identical summary, not quite as complete, is to be found in Cornelius a Lapide's *Commentaria in Pentateuchum Mosis* (Antuerpiae, 1630), pp. 53-54. Pererius (pp. 58-59) answers each of these objections point by point. The one that gave him the most difficulty was the reference in *Genesis* to Anan's inventing (*inuenisse*) mules in the desert, which he got around by quibbling with the text, reading the Hebrew *Iemin* as *water* instead of *mules*, after Jerome and Oleaster. See also Hottinger's *Juris Hebraeorum Leges CCLXI* (Tiguri, 1655), pp. 374-375.

great whales, and other creatures of the sea? As opposed to the one about hybrids, this was a problem that appealed to the Middle Ages and earlier, rather than to the Renaissance. Ambrose seems to have been the first to think of it. In his *Hexaameron* he argued etymologically that since amphibians do not use their feet for walking when they are in the water, but rather as oars for creeping (*reptans*) over the surface on their bellies, they are to be thought of as water reptiles and were therefore created with the fish on the fifth day (PL 14, 220-221). That does not seem like much of an answer, but it was apparently convincing to a number of others. The same argument is to be found in Basil's *Homilia VII in Hexaameron* (PG 29, 147), which entered Western tradition through the Latin paraphrase of Eustathius (PL 53, 957-958); and even Abelard condescended to use it in his *Expositio in Hexaameron* (PL 178, 756), quoting Ambrose directly and with approval. Aquinas, however, not Ambrose, was the one who apparently disposed of the problem for the Renaissance. At any rate it disappeared after him for about four hundred years, until Milton revived it. According to Aquinas, there is no real difficulty. Wherever there are two extremes there is always something in the middle to join them. Class necessarily shades into class. All you need is Aristotle and a little common sense. Amphibians are most like fish; they were therefore created on the fifth day—as simple as that.<sup>6</sup>

Insects were another problem. Milton introduces them toward the end of his account, under the general heading of reptiles:

At once came forth whatever creeps the ground,  
Insect or Worm; those wav'd thir limber fans  
For wings, and smallest Lineaments exact  
In all the Liveries deckt of Summer's pride  
With spots of Gold and Purple, azure and green:  
These as a line thir long dimension drew,  
Streaking the ground with sinuous trace. (475-481)

Most educated men of Milton's time and earlier—in fact ever since the time of the Greeks—knew that insects were produced exclusively from corruption, spontaneously generated from rotting leaves, dead bodies, all sorts of putrefaction. And the problem for the exegetes was precisely that: there were no dead bodies and no compost heaps around for them to come from when the world was new. If there were, it would have been a serious argument against the perfection

<sup>6</sup> *Summa Theologica*, I, I, Q. 71. For somewhat the same thing a little earlier, see Bede's *Hexaameron*, PL 91, 26 and Rabanus Maurus' *Commentariorum in Genesim Libri Quatuor*, PL 107, 456.



of the first creation. God made life, not death. Where, then, did they come from? Were they created by God directly, despite the difficulties involved; or did they come in later after having been created potentially in the beginning; or did they simply arise when they had material to come from, without the necessity of a separate creation since they were implied in the creation of everything else? Or were they the result of original sin? Perhaps if Adam had not fallen and brought death into the world and all our woe, there would have been no insects either. The exegetes were not certain, and there was at least one major figure in the tradition who argued for each of those positions.<sup>7</sup>

Augustine, however, is the one usually associated with the idea. In *De Genesi ad Litteram* he distinguished between certain insects bred from water and earth and others which came from the corruption of living bodies. The former he thought were part of the initial creation, but not the latter: "absurdissima est dicere tunc create, cum animalia ipsa creata sunt." Yet, evoking his theory of *rationales seminales*, he was willing to believe that even these could have been created by God potentially, in the beginning, in some mysterious way:

nisi quia inerat iam omnibus animatis corporibus uis quaedam naturalis et quasi praeseminata et quodammodo licitata primordia futurorum animalium, quae de corruptionibus talium corporum pro suo quaeque genere ac differentiis erant exortura per administrationem ineffabilem omnia mouente incommutabiliter creatore.<sup>8</sup>

Aquinas was somewhat less strict. He went so far as to admit to the first creation all insects that came from rotting vegetation:

Ad quintum dicendum, quod cum generatio unius sit corruptio alterius, quod ex corruptione ignobiliorum generentur nobiliora, non repugnat primae rerum institutioni. Unde animalia quae generantur ex corruptione rerum inanimatarum, vel plantarum, potuerunt tunc generari; non autem quae generantur ex corruptione animalium, tunc potuerunt produci, nisi potentialiter tantum.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Pererius (pp. 57-58) gives a fairly thorough survey of previous opinion. Besides the authors I mention later in the text, see also Basil, *PG* 29, 147, 190-191; Eustathius, *PL* 53, 935; *Glossa Ordinaria*, *PL* 113, 79; Hottinger, *ΚΤΙΣΙΣ ΕΞΑΗΜΕΡΟΣ*, pp. 231-232; 233-235.

<sup>8</sup> *CSEL*, 28, 80 (III, 14). Augustine's overall theory of creation is too complex to summarize briefly, but in essence it was an attempt to explain how the creation was at once instantaneous and at the same time serial, unfolding itself through certain incomprehensible units of time known in *Genesis* as days. God spoke in the beginning and in that instant implanted the essences (*rationales seminales*) of all things, which later took on actuality in the course of creation. A distinction between potential and actual creation was thus at the heart of Augustine's theory, and whenever any difficulty came up such as the insects, he had only to evoke the general principle to dispose of it.

<sup>9</sup> *Summa Theologica*, I, I, Q. 72.

Still, the general position was the same as Augustine's and it was that, without Aquinas' qualification, that became the most popular one in the Renaissance. Like Aquinas, almost all the commentators utilized Augustine's distinction between potential and actual creation, but not the overall theory of creation that went along with it and gave it meaning. Cornelius a Lapide, for example, asserts quite definitely that fleas, mice, and other grubs ("alijque vermiculi") were created only potentially on the sixth day ("non . . . formaliter, sed potentialiter") and then, glancing back directly at Augustine, adds "quasi in seminali rationali."<sup>10</sup> Pererius eventually arrived at a similar position, but he was considerably less satisfied with it. He presents it more as a final possibility than as a definite conclusion. But even Pererius was sure about one thing: there were no fleas on Adam and Eve, and no lice either:

Illud tamē videtur posse dici affirmatē, animalia quae ex humani corporis aliqua corruptione vel intemperie in ipso gignuntur, & in eo non sine molestia, & offensione hominis semper inhaerent, tunc non fuisse: eorum namque generationem foelicissimo illi hominis statui valde alienam, & indecoram fore arbitramur.<sup>11</sup>

With the hybrids, then, Milton seems to have followed Pererius. With the amphibians and, to a lesser extent, with the insects, he apparently formulated his own answer, setting himself up against almost fifteen hundred years of tradition. In each case he seems to have gone out of his way to adopt an opinion directly contrary to the one held by most of his contemporaries. But it is not that. Milton used the tradition; he loaded his verse with classic examples of all the problems involved, the ones usually used for illustration by the commentators themselves; and he expected his readers to be aware of it. But he was not attempting to find any answers, either his own or others. He introduced the problems only to prove that they do not exist or, perhaps more accurately, that they were incapable of solution in the traditional way.

By the late seventeenth century science had ravaged most of the strongholds of man's mind. There is no need to go into all of that

<sup>10</sup> *Commentaria in Pentateuchum Mosis*, p. 53.

<sup>11</sup> *Commentariorum et Disputationum in Genesim*, p. 58. Another set of problems similar to the ones outlined in this paper involved the animals on the ark. Commentators wondered, for example, whether it was necessary to include the hybrids, since in a way they were already there, or the insects, since they would have had enough dead bodies to proceed from by themselves after the waters receded. See Don Cameron Allen, *The Legend of Noah*, *Illinois Studies in Lang. and Lit.*, 33 (Urbana, 1949), pp. 72, 80, 185-186. Milton refers to the difficulty later on in *Paradise Lost*, somewhat obliquely, by mentioning the insects entering the ark (XI, 733-736).

here, simply to recall the fact and to realize that the problems the exegetes were dealing with were part of that overall movement. They were attempting to subject primitive myth, a symbolic gesture designed to be understood in the same way as poetry, to the hard facts of scientific rationalism, and the more they tried, of course, the more they failed. Milton, who lived a little later than the rest of them and was therefore perhaps more disenchanted with Renaissance rationalism, seems to have recognized the failure and the need for a new direction. And since he was a poet engaged in the same essential act of creation as God himself, he had one at hand, the same one God had. He could act, simply and absolutely, without the need for quibbling or intellectualizing and in that way prove imaginatively, at least for the moment of the verse, what was otherwise incapable of rational solution. He filled his verse with every quasi-scientific problem he could think of not because he knew the answers, but precisely because the answers did not exist and did not matter anyway. By refusing to recognize their validity, he demonstrated not only their futility, but also, in a grimly humorous way, his own stiff-necked disdain.

What Milton turned to was a form of faith, not what we usually think of as faith, a state of serene certitude surrounded by mystery, but a peculiar, negative variety, something that was more of a defense against reason than anything positive and valuable in itself. It seems almost like poetic faith: a willing suspension of disbelief that operated within and for the brief duration of a few lines of poetry. Instead of being more than reason, it seems somehow less, or at least different; thoroughly other. There are two truths, Milton seems to be saying, the truth of science and the truth of religion, and he presents them both at once. Superficially, his attitude is that of a hard-shell fundamentalist who takes his Bible straight, like everything else, and believes every word of it, whether it makes sense or not; but at the same time it is also that of a seriously disturbed student who has studied the tradition, realized the limits of reason, and is willing to take God's Word for it, even if he cannot understand it. It is at once a form of arrogance, in other words, and an admission of defeat symptomatic of the collapse of the grand design of the Renaissance. Faith in reason had finally led to an over-extension of reason and an inevitable recoil in confusion, where men either wandered alone or fell back on the rock of ages, deeply cleft, but still firmly intrenched by narrow-minded men and poets.

*Yale University*

FRANK MANLEY

## The Publication of *Olor Iscanus*

Professor W. R. Parker and Professor E. L. Marilla have by their independent efforts greatly clarified the perplexing circumstances surrounding the publication of Henry Vaughan's second book of secular verse. Professor Parker has argued persuasively that *Olor Iscanus* (1651), was edited and published by the poet's friend, Thomas Powell,<sup>1</sup> and Professor Marilla has convincingly interpreted the unsigned "The Publisher to the Reader" (attributed to Powell) as an ingenious attempt to obscure the author's responsibility for publication.<sup>2</sup> The purpose of this device was to protect Vaughan from political repercussion which might result from the violently anti-Parliamentarian sentiments expressed in some of the poems.<sup>3</sup> Vaughan's own attitude toward Powell's scheme still awaits definitive explanation, and this hiatus leaves room for conjectures that it was undertaken at his instigation or at least with his active approval and support.

There is in fact an impressive body of evidence to show that Vaughan had no fear of the Parliamentarians nor of the vengeful measures which they might easily be prompted to take against him; or, if he did have such fears, they did not deter him from writing violent denunciations of his enemies nor from accepting with impunity full responsibility for publication of his attacks. In *Poems* (1646), he covertly ridiculed the Parliament,<sup>4</sup> even though he had recently returned from a military campaign in which the Royalist cause in Wales had been soundly beaten. But the most extended and explicit attacks on the rebels are found in the devotional prose works, *The*

<sup>1</sup> "Henry Vaughan and his Publishers," *The Library*, Fourth Series, xx (1940), 401-411.

<sup>2</sup> "'The Publisher to the Reader' of *Olor Iscanus*," *R. E. S.*, xxiv (1948), 36-41.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. F. E. Hutchinson argues in his *Henry Vaughan: A Life and Interpretation* (Oxford, 1947), p. 77, that "Vaughan must seek to reduce any sense of inconsistency between the tone of *Olor Iscanus* and that of *Silex Scintillans* already published in the previous year. This might be best effected by describing the poems on the title-page as "Formerly written" and "Published by a Friend," which, together with the preface, would reduce the author's responsibility for publishing his secular verse." However, Professor Marilla has shown, in "Henry Vaughan's Conversion: A Recent View," *MLN*, lxxiii (1948), 394-397, that Vaughan in 1651 was aware of no inconsistency between *Olor Iscanus* and *Silex Scintillans* (p. 394). The necessary inference is that Vaughan could not have been impelled by the motives Hutchinson advances to attempt to reduce his responsibility for publishing *Olor Iscanus*.

<sup>4</sup> "A Rhapsodis," *The Works of Henry Vaughan*, ed. L. C. Martin, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1957), pp. 10-12. References throughout are to this edition.

*Mount of Olives* (1652), and *Flores Solitudinis* (1654). In the dedication of the former work, he casts an oblique aspersion on the insurgents' moral character, and refers more directly to their persecution of the Anglican Church: "And indeed (considering how *fast* and how *soone* men degenerate), It must be counted for a great *blessing*, that there is yet any left which dares *look* upon, and *com-miserate* distressed Religion. *Good men* in *bad times* are very scarce . . ." (p. 138). In the preface to the reader he characterizes the Puritans as false prophets, praying that the loyal followers of the established faith will "not be discouraged in this way, because very many are gone out of it. . . . *Presse thou towards the mark*, and let the people and their Seducers rage" (p. 141). The preface opens even more vigorously with an imputation of hypocrisy to the Puritans (p. 140):

I know the world abounds with these Manuals, and triumphs over them. It is not then their scarcity that call'd this forth, nor yet a desire to crosse the age, nor any in it. I envie not their frequent *Extasies*, and raptures to the third heaven; I onely wish them real, and that their actions did not tell the world, they are rapt into some other place. Nor should they, who assume to themselves the glorious stile of Saints, be uncharitably moved, if we that are yet in the body, and carry our treasure in earthen vessels, have need of these helps.

Vaughan's reference to the closed Anglican churches, in the "Admonitions how to carry thy self in the Church," could have been no more congenial to the Puritans, with its obvious implication that they are not "true Christians" and its open avowal that their prohibitions are defied: "There reverend and sacred buildings (however now vilified and shut up) have ever been, and amongst true Christians still are the solempne and publike places of meeting for Divine Worship" (p. 147). A longer and more overt attack on the Parliamentarians as heretics and persecutors of religion occurs at the beginning of "A Prayer in time of persecution and Heresie" (p. 166):

Most glorious and Immortall God, the Prince of peace, unity and order, which makest men to be of one mind in a house, heale I beseech thee these present sad breaches and distractions! Consider, O Lord, the teares of thy Spouse which are daily upon her cheeks, whose adversaries are grown mighty, and her enemies prosper. The ways of *Zion* do mourne, our beautiful gates are shut up, and the Comforter that should relieve our souls is gone far from us. Thy Service and thy Sabbaths, thy own sacred Institutions and the pledges of thy love are denied unto us; Thy Ministers are trodden down, and the basest of the people are set up in thy holy place.

To this should be added the eloquent lament in similar terms occurring in "Man in Darkness," which Vaughan intensifies with the telling accusation of regicide (pp. 170-171):

We could not have lived in an age of more instruction, had we been left to our own choice. We have seen such vicissitudes and examples of humane frailty, as the former world (had they happened in those ages) would have judged prodigies. We have seen Princes brought to their graves by a new way, and the highest order of humane honours trampled upon by the lowest. We have seene Judgement beginning at Gods Church, and (what hath beene never heard of, since it was redeem'd and established by his blessed Son,) we have seen his Ministers cast out of the Sanctuary, & barbarous persons without *light or perfection*, usurping holy offices.

In the most violent attack here on the Parliamentarians, Vaughan ascribes to them "A pretended *sanctity* from the teeth outward, with the frequent *mention* of the *Spirit*, and a presumptuous assuming to our selves of the stile of *Saints*," and declares that they are in fact "full of *subtilty, malice, oppression, lewd opinions, and diverse lusts*" (p. 182).

*Flores Solitudinis* is likewise studded with virulent attacks upon the Parliamentarians, many of them interpolated by Vaughan into translated material. In the prefatory "To the Reader," he exhorts faithful Christians not to become "the *Apes* of those Melancholy *Schismatics*, who having burnt off their owne hands in setting the world on fire, are now fallen out with it, *because they cannot rule it*"; he declares that he writes "out of a land of darkenesse, out of that unfortunate region, where the Inhabitants sit in the shadow of death: where destruction passeth for propagation, and a thick black night for the glorious day-spring."<sup>5</sup> Later, describing the evils of life, he again imputes hypocrisy to the Puritans; these "murtherers" who are "pretending Religion, Piety, and the Glory of God," are in truth characterized by "tyranny, covetousnesse, & sacriledge varnished outwardly with godly pretences, dissembled purity, and the stale shift of liberty of Conscience" (p. 278). He refers again to the Propagation Acts in repeating the charge of hypocrisy: "Some dispositions love to stand in the raine, and affect wind and showers beyond Musick. *Paulinus* sure was of this temper; he preferred the indignation and hatred of the multitude to their love, he would not buy their friendship with the losse of Heaven, nor call those Saints and

<sup>5</sup> Martin, pp. 216-217; "where destruction passeth for propagation" refers to the Act for the Propagation of the Gospel in Wales (1649/1650), under which many Anglican clergymen, including Thomas Powell and the poet's brother Thomas, were ejected from their livings.



propagators, who were Devills and destroyers" (p. 346). The charge, made also in *The Mount of Olives*, that the Puritans have destroyed religion by opening the ministry to impious and ignorant men, recurs here (p. 354):

It was a perillous dissolutenesse of some Bishops in that Century, to admit of Lay-men, and unseason'd persons into the Ministry. This rash and impious practice *Siricius* had, by severall strict Sanctions or decrees, condemned and forbidden. . . . It is a sad truth that this pernicious rashnesse of Bishops (fighting *ex diametro* with the Apostolical cautions) hath oftentimes brought boars into the Vineyard, and Wolves into the sheep-fold; which complying afterwards with all manner of Interests, have torne out the bowels of their Mother. Wee need no examples: Wee have lived to see all this our selves. Ignorance and obstinacie make *Hereticks*: And ambition makes *Schismatics*; when they are once at this passe, they are on the way toward *Atheisme*.

This accusation that the Puritans are merely the irresponsible agents of heresy and sc..ism, impelled by ignorance, obstinacy, and ambition, recurs twice mor in this book. Praising the "Conformity and obedience to the Chu ch" exhibited by Paulinus, Vaughan declares that this quality is "a blessing of no small consequence in all ages, especially in this age of *Schismes* and *Heresies*" (p. 377). On the second occasion, he returns also to his favorite charge of hypocrisy: "It was not the Custome, but the nature (if I may so say) of those Primitive times to love holy and peacefull men. But some *great ones* in this later age, did nothing else but countenance *Schismatics* and *seditionous raylers*, the *despisers of dignities*, that covered their *abominable villanies* with a pretence of *transcendent holinesse*, and a certain *Sanctimonious excellencie* above the Sons of men" (p. 371). And, finally, he attacks the Parliamentarians for having prohibited the celebration of Christmas and Easter, and attributes to them motives which they would have repudiated vigorously (p. 379):

Two *Seasons* in the year were consecrated by the *Church* to the memory of our *Saviour*: The *Feast* of his *Nativity* and *Circumcision*, and the *Feast* of his *Passion* and *Resurrection*. These two they have utterly taken away: endeavouring (in my opinion) to extinguish the *memory* of his *Incarnation* and *Passion*, and to race his blessed name out of those *bright columnes of light*, which the *Scripture* calls *daies*. They will not allow him two daies in the year, who made the dayes and the nights. But it is much to be feared, that he who hath appointed their daies here, will allow them for it long nights.

The bold, outspoken criticism of the Parliamentarians (amounting sometimes to vilification), which runs through *The Mount of Olives* and *Flores Solitudinis*, might easily have impelled them to take

reprisals against the author. But this definite possibility did not deter him from setting them publicly at complete defiance, nor prompt him to take any measures whatever to conceal his authorship or to obscure his responsibility for publishing his remarks. With this evidence of Vaughan's temerity before a distinct likelihood of severe persecution, we can only infer that he did not himself seek by any subterfuge to avoid the possibly disastrous consequences of publishing *Olor Iscanus*. It appears a necessary conclusion that Powell's attempt to obscure Vaughan's responsibility for the publication was undertaken, if not against Vaughan's will, then at least without his co-operation and certainly not at his instigation, stimulated as it was by a concern for his safety which he did not share with his older and more circumspect friend.

University of Kentucky

JAMES D. SIMMONDS

## Henry Fielding's 'Lost' Law Book

In the latter-day rehabilitation of Fielding from charges of personal immorality (Arthur Murphy and assorted contemporaries) or philosophical intransigence (Dr. Johnson and his biographer, Hawkins) one or two matters have continued to disturb the apologists. The relationship to Sir Robert Walpole, for example, has lately been set forth so as to suggest that the traditional image of Fielding as a paragon of political integrity is "largely a fiction."<sup>1</sup> Yet even this bold and attractive hypothesis stops considerably short of charging pure political opportunism. Instead, the accent falls on the pathos of personal want in a context of contemporary political hypocrisy.

Of less importance, but of similar implication, is the burden of a contemporary anecdote having to do with Fielding's conduct as a lawyer. In excerpting from Murphy's biography of the same year the *Annual Register* for 1762 adds a footnote of its own which seems to imply a departure from strictest probity in the new barrister:

The gentlemen of the western circuit have a tradition concerning Fielding, which, though somewhat inconsistent with the account that Mr. M[murphy] has given of him, yet is perfectly agreeable to the idea generally entertained of his humour and character. Having attended the judges two or three years

<sup>1</sup> Martin C. Battestin, "Fielding's Changing Politics and *Joseph Andrews*," *PQ*, XXXIX (1960), 39-55. The quotation is from p. 53.



without the least prospect of success, he published proposals for a new law-book: which being circulated around the country, the young barrister was, at the ensuing assizes, loaded with briefs at every town on the circuit.—But his practice thus suddenly increased, almost as suddenly declined.<sup>2</sup>

Although no such "proposals" have ever been identified, the consensus is that if they appeared at all, it must have been relatively early in Fielding's legal career. In the "Preface" he contributed to the second edition (1744) of his sister's *David Simple* Fielding speaks of the diligence with which he had applied himself to the law, a diligence so arduous and so intent, he says, that he had not time for purely literary matters.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, according to Murphy, the attacks of gout which Fielding himself had blamed for helping to delay publication of the *Miscellanies* also forced him to pursue his legal career "by starts, and after frequent intermissions."<sup>4</sup> And finally, so the tradition goes, the death of the first Mrs. Fielding in the autumn of 1744 "brought on such a vehemence of grief, that his friends began to think him in danger of losing his reason."<sup>5</sup> In 1745 and after, what with political journalism, the Bow Street magistracy and his return to extended prose fiction, Fielding's physical and temperamental frailties might have found much to confirm them.

Unable to locate any proposals for a law book, Cross conjectured that the *Annual Register* reference must have been to the proposals for the *Miscellanies*,<sup>6</sup> presumably on the grounds that such proposals do exist and do date, what is more, from 1742, which fits conveniently with the *Annual Register* anecdote.<sup>7</sup> However, on Murphy's deposition that Fielding at his death left "two volumes upon that subject," recent students of Fielding's legal career presume rather that the proposals referred to in the *Annual Register* anecdote were in fact for a work on Crown Law.<sup>8</sup> Certainly, the sale catalogue of Fielding's

<sup>2</sup> "Some Account of the late Henry Fielding, Esq.," in *Annual Register . . . for the Year 1762*, 6th ed. (London, 1805), "Characters," p. 18n.

<sup>3</sup> *Complete Works*, ed. W. E. Henley (London, 1903), XVI, 7-8.

<sup>4</sup> "An Essay on the Life and Genius of Henry Fielding, Esq.," in *Works*, ed. Murphy (London, 1762), I, 37.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 38.

<sup>6</sup> *The History of Henry Fielding* (New Haven, 1918), II, 2.

<sup>7</sup> Fielding entered the Middle Temple on 1 November 1737 and was "called" to the bar on 20 June 1740. See the *Register of Admissions to the Honourable Society of the Middle Temple*, ed. H. A. C. Sturges (London, 1949), I, 322. Normally, barristers were expected to continue their "exercises" for about three years before they were allowed to practice on their own in the courts. However, Fielding seems to have had permission from the Masters of the Bench as early as 15 July 1740. See B. M. Jones, *Henry Fielding, Novelist and Magistrate* (London, 1933), p. 72f.

<sup>8</sup> For example, Jones, p. 96.

library substantiates Murphy's claim that Fielding was considered by his contemporaries to be learned in that particular branch of the law.<sup>9</sup> Unfortunately, however, the two volumes in folio which Murphy said Sir John Fielding told him were "deemed perfect in some parts" do not appear to have survived.<sup>10</sup> Nor are they listed in the sale catalogue.

Despite the lack of firm evidence it seems possible to argue that Fielding's unpublished folios were based, perhaps in large part, upon the notes of his maternal grandfather, Sir Henry Gould, who had established a certain reputation on the King's Bench. Something of the sort, at least, may be inferred from the professed opinions of *Old England* in 1748, one of whose 'correspondents' reported that Fielding "boasts so loud of his Knowledge that way [i.e., in the Law], and of his being brought to Bed soon of a Law-Book, begotten upon himself by the *Notes of an old Judge*, which is to be published at the same Time with Six Volumes of his Novels."<sup>11</sup> Although *Old England's* attitude toward Fielding was remarkably hostile, even for the times—the juxtaposition of law book and prose fiction is calculated satire<sup>12</sup>—there is plausibility in its editor's assertion that the projected law book consisted of "some Reports in GOULD MSS."<sup>13</sup>

<sup>9</sup> *A Catalogue of the Entire and Valuable Library of Books of the late Henry Fielding, Esq.*, (London, [1755]), p. 5, items 90 and 102, and p. 6, items 131 and 136, lists the relevant holdings. The two volumes of Hawkins' *Pleas of the Crown* (1726) are described as "with a great number of MSS. Notes by Mr. Fielding."

<sup>10</sup> "Essay" in *Works*, I, 29. A search of the registers of the Stationers' Company for the years 1745-54 reveals no entry for such a book, but at mid-century this can hardly be called definitive evidence one way or the other.

<sup>11</sup> *Old England* #226 (Saturday, September 3, 1748), in a letter signed 'Primonides.' If it can be taken seriously, the allusion here would seem to be to an advertisement which also announced the future publication of *Tom Jones*. Fielding's signed receipt for the £600 which Millar paid him for the copyright of *Tom Jones* is dated 11 June 1748 and states that "The said Work [is] to contain Six Volumes in Duodecimo." See G. M. Godden, *Henry Fielding* (London, 1910), p. 304. J. Paul De Castro, "The Printing of Fielding's Works," *The Library*, Fourth Series, Vol. I (1920-21), 262, records evidence from Strahan's ledgers which suggests that as early as November, 1747, Fielding planned to publish *Tom Jones* by subscription. It is thus just possible that by 3 September 1748 the public had been told of the format of Fielding's forthcoming novel. However, I can locate no 1748 advertisements for the law book, and the use of the plural form *Novels* by the *Old England* 'correspondent' militates against a serious reading of the remark.

<sup>12</sup> Among the hostile journals of the day it was a common tactic to berate Fielding for attempting two professions at the same time.

<sup>13</sup> *Old England* #245 (Saturday, January 7, 1749). Further references to the Gould MSS. occur in *Old England* #275 (Saturday, August 5, 1749), and #290 (Saturday, November 25, 1749). Some of these are noted by Jones, pp. 94-95. Just how Fielding came into possession of the Gould materials when there were at least two Gould relations (his uncle Davidge and his cousin Henry) then active in the law, is not clear.

But before the rumored book based on the Gould notes can be identified, even tentatively, with the unpublished folios to which Murphy refers, there is the problem of reconciling the date at which *Old England's* 'correspondent' reported it (3 September 1748) with the date implied by the *Annual Register* account (c. 1743). It is just possible that Fielding was active on the western circuit in the summer of 1748,<sup>14</sup> but by then considerably more than "two or three years" had elapsed since he first attended the judges.

It can now be demonstrated, however, that the *Old England* references to a Fielding law book are by no means the earliest. Although no actual "proposals" for the work on Crown Law have been found, the imminence of such a work is implied by hitherto unnoticed advertisements in the contemporary press of early 1745. Announced in the *General Evening Post* for February 26-28, 1745, under the heading "Shortly will be publish'd" are "Two VOLUMES in Folio" entitled "An Institute of the Pleas of the Crown." As given in the advertisement, the running title is amply descriptive:

Containing a compleat Series of the Law in all Criminal Matters, as it is laid down in the several Acts of Parliament, the Year Books, Books of Reports, &c. From the Times of Edward the First to the present. Together with the Methods of proceeding against Offenders, from the first Process to attack their Persons to the Judgment and its final Consequences; and in Cases where the Judgment is reversed, to the Restitution on such Reversal by Writ of Error.

Digested in a Method most adapted to Practice; with correct Precedents of Indictments, and other Entries, on the Several Heads, taken from the Records.

To which are added, Notes explaining the most difficult Passages, Terms of Art and Distinctions that occur through the Whole, and referring to particular Instances in which our Crown Law hath borrow'd from or agrees with the Institutions of other Countries relating to the Criminal Matters.

And most important of all, the author of the two volumes in folio is stated to be "Henry Fielding, of the Middle-Temple, Esq; Barrister at Law."

Everything considered, the advertisement seems genuine enough. Indeed, proponents of the *hath-doth* test for style may wish to argue that Fielding wrote it himself. Furthermore, the identical advertisement is repeated, twice, at intervals of a week in the same paper.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>14</sup> *London Evening Post* #3188 (Thursday, April 7—Saturday, April 9, 1748) professes to hope Fielding will get some law work, especially during the summer assizes in Bucks. But of course the latter did not come under the western circuit to which Fielding was assigned, and the *Post's* remark must be recognized as a hit at his close ties with Lyttelton and the politicians.

<sup>15</sup> *General Evening Post* #1788 (March 5-7, 1745) and #1791 (March 12-14, 1745).

Perhaps the major objection to taking the advertisement seriously, namely, the absence of any publisher's name, is removed by the appearance of a modified version almost a month later. In the *Daily Post* for Monday, March 25, 1745, there is the following important addition: "Printed and sold by A. Millar against Katherine Street in the Strand." This assignment to Fielding's principal publisher can be found again four days later in the *Daily Post*, as well as in the *London Evening Post* of April 2-4, 1745.

Admittedly, Millar may not have been above some of the sharp practice common to publishing in his day,<sup>16</sup> but it does not seem likely that he would have permitted the use of his name three times in such an explicit connection unless he had either considerable manuscript evidence or strong personal assurance that the work in question was nearly completed. Nor, on the other hand, would Fielding have been likely to risk compromising the relationship with his principal publisher by 'puffing' non-existent projects at the expense of the publisher's reputation. Finally, the announced subject is Crown Law, the very subject in which Murphy conceded Fielding to be especially learned, and the announced size is "Two VOLUMES in Folio," the very size and, indeed, the very number of volumes which Murphy said had been left unpublished by Fielding at his death. Only the date fails to fit, and the now relatively smaller discrepancy may be owing to a combination of circumstances: the likelihood that the 1745 advertisements followed by a considerable period of time any original "proposals" of the work that may have been made public;<sup>17</sup> the somewhat offhand nature of the *Annual Register* anecdote, which has more than a trace of indifference to detail; and finally, contemporary uncertainty as to the dates of Fielding's remarkably accelerated 'probation' in the law.<sup>18</sup>

Matters of unresolved chronology notwithstanding, the discovery

<sup>16</sup> Millar told his friend David Hume that "I said I considered yr Works as Classicks, that I never numbered ye Editions as I did in Books We wished to puff." *Letters of David Hume*, ed. J. Y. T. Greig (Oxford, 1932), II, 354.

<sup>17</sup> It is entirely possible, of course, that no "proposals" as such were ever published. The *Annual Register* anecdote may have been founded solely on the appearance of advertisements like those noted above.

<sup>18</sup> In his "Essay," p. 28, Murphy writes that Fielding was called to the bar "after the customary time of probation," but the Middle Temple records clearly contradict him. For an even wilder chronology of Fielding's legal training, see *The Tryal of Colley Cibber, Comedian* (London, 1740), 'Advertisement,' p. 40, where it is said that Fielding "upon his Return from his Travels entered Himself of the Temple in order to study the Law, and married one of the pretty Miss *Cradocks* of *Salisbury*." This would appear to argue a date somewhere between 1730 and 1734.

of explicit advertisements concerning a work on Crown Law does permit adjustments in the traditional account of Fielding's activity in the years immediately following publication of the *Miscellanies*. To begin with, his own statement of 1744 that he was working hard at the law may now be supported with some assurance. And the supposed lull in his published output—somewhat more than two years at the inside<sup>19</sup>—may now be put down, not just to the well-known "Train of melancholy Accidents," but partly to tangible labors in the literature of his new profession. To have a pair of folio volumes sufficiently advanced to warrant public announcement at a date little more than three months after his wife's death implies at least some sort of continued activity in the stricken man. Further, the advertisements suggest both that there is some substance in the *Annual Register* anecdote and that remarks about the "idea generally entertained of his humour and character" may be out of place. Lastly, when coupled with the gossip from *Old England*, the advertisements suggest one reason why Fielding may have felt ready to announce a sizeable law book so early in his career, namely, the acquisition, by means unknown, of the law notes of his maternal grandfather. Granted these hypotheses, we may wish to conclude that the folios to which Murphy alludes were about as far advanced in 1745 as they were when Fielding died.

Why the work was not pushed to completion in the comparatively unbusy months before the anti-Jacobite activity in October, 1745, present evidence does not disclose. Certainly the traditional picture of a Fielding roused by the Jacobite crisis from the lethargy of grief and ill-health does not seem altogether satisfactory. On the other hand, any loss of biographical pathos may be more than compensated for by the not unaffecting fact that during the nine remaining years of his life Fielding's 'lost' law book, though "perfect in some parts," lay yet unborn. It was, in the metaphor of *Old England*, a long *accouchement*. What might have happened to Fielding's later career had he 'induced' the book in the year it was advertised, it is pointless, if touching, to speculate.

Wesleyan University  
Middletown, Conn.

WILLIAM B. COLEY

<sup>19</sup> Always excepting the "correction of some small errors" in the second edition (1744) of *David Simple*, and *An Attempt towards a Natural History of the Hanover Rat* (1744). For the latter, see Gerard E. Jensen, "A Fielding Discovery," *Yale University Library Gazette*, X (1935), 23-32. The case is dubious.



## A Neglected Theme in Tennyson's *In Memoriam*

One very significant development in the spiritual history recorded in *In Memoriam* seems not to have been quite clearly discerned hitherto. Commentators have tended to suggest that the progress of the soul from despair to faith is to be seen, despite occasional setbacks, as a continuous, gradual ascent. Actually, the poem describes first a signal failure, which is followed by a dramatically sudden and unexpected success. It is apparent, moreover, that the spiritual predicament of the poet is such that failure and especially a certain attitude toward failure are indispensable conditions of ultimate success.

Two recent essays have done much to reveal the organic unity of the elegy. Together they point to, though neither quite clearly establishes, the crucial importance in the poem of the theme of personal defeat, or failure of inspiration. Professor E. D. H. Johnson, in his admirably lucid article "‘In Memoriam’: the Way of the Poet," rightly asserts that "the processes of philosophic and aesthetic growth exhibited in the poem are so interrelated in their successive phases as to be inseparable."<sup>1</sup> Because he follows Bradley's schematization, however, he does not, in his analysis of the successive phases of growth, place much emphasis on or clearly describe the development in question here, which begins in the middle of the second section and ends in the middle of the third. Professor Johnson's timely insistence upon the importance of the theme of poetic vision in *In Memoriam* recalls the brief but penetrating analysis of the poem offered by Professor A. J. Carr in "Tennyson as a Modern Poet."<sup>2</sup> Professor Carr makes the point that "the death of Arthur Hallam is both a real and a symbolic loss that radiates from the centre of Tennyson's art."<sup>3</sup> "The stages and the achievement of *In Memoriam*," he says further, "are in some respects more clearly visible in those other poems that the death of Hallam almost immediately called forth"<sup>4</sup>—"The Two Voices," "Ulysses," "Tithonus," and "Morte d'Arthur." Yet in spite of his provocative assertion that in "Ulysses" Tennyson forecasts in small compass the answer of *In Memoriam*, and his remark that "‘Morte d'Arthur’ unites the themes of all these poems in Sir Bedivere who

<sup>1</sup> *Victorian Studies*, II (December, 1958), 140. Professor C. R. Sonn makes the same point in "Poetic Vision and Religious Certainty in Tennyson's Earlier Poetry," *Modern Philology*, LVII (November, 1959), 83-93; he does not, however, deal with the theme under discussion here.

<sup>2</sup> *The University of Toronto Quarterly*, XIX (July, 1950), 361-382.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 373.

<sup>4</sup> *Loc. cit.*



must 'go forth companionless,' and in the death of King Arthur,"<sup>5</sup> Professor Carr's discussion of the stages of the development of the theme of reunion in *In Memoriam* omits mention of the crucial stage of renunciation.<sup>6</sup>

Yet when "Ulysses" and "Morte d'Arthur" in particular are taken to be partial recapitulations of the experience embodied in *In Memoriam*, it is apparent at once that we have to do with a pattern of aspiration, defeat, resignation, and consequent expectation of afflatus. "Morte d'Arthur" very clearly suggests that the necessary condition for the deepest possible spiritual assurance is self-renunciation, humble though not ignoble capitulation. The analysis of the poem in Professor W. D. Paden's seminal study *Tennyson in Egypt*<sup>7</sup> makes perfectly clear the nature of the symbolic relationship between Hallam and Tennyson that tended to emerge in the poetry at this time. King Arthur, who is evidently both a projection of the poet's psychic needs and a symbol of their sanctification, must suffer earthly defeat before he can be received by the heavenly queens that eternally support him; and Bedivere must suffer a similar defeat, symbolized by the relinquishing of Excalibur, in order to preserve the hope of reunion with a divine Arthur. Ulysses likewise must embark upon a lonely journey into darkness, attended by shadowy "comrades" who symbolize only the hope that the subjective impulse represented by the voyage is valid to the extent of being shared by some others. So in *In Memoriam*, before his dream of reunion with an angelic Arthur, with Arthur apotheosized, can acquire the reality of a vital truth, the poet must acknowledge a sense of almost complete personal helplessness and hopelessness. The acceptance of failure and the adoption of a passive role mark the central crisis of the poem.

The crucial spiritual capitulation is tantamount to the acceptance of a paradox, or an unsolvable dilemma. The problem arises because the poet's grief for Arthur is from the beginning, as Professor Carr points out, most closely associated with a highly personal and subjective complex of desire, hope, and fear, a pre-existing complex in which the idea of poetic vision is hardly distinguishable from that of religious insight.<sup>8</sup> The symbolic Arthur merges with such deity-symbols as Haroun Alraschid and Father Hesper. For the poet to

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., p. 375.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., p. 376.

<sup>7</sup> *Tennyson in Egypt, A Study of the Imagery in His Earlier Work* (Lawrence, Kansas, 1942). See pp. 81-88.

<sup>8</sup> Professor Sonn's observations (op. cit.) are most helpful here.

cling to his grief, therefore, is equivalent to affirming a daring romantic faith in personal visionary power—a faith that always wavered. On the other hand, Arthur, as a former source of help and correction in the world of objective reality and a being now invulnerable to earthly shocks, also symbolizes the poet's need of a "revealed" or *external* sanction of a supernatural order, a need of course attended by strong misgivings. The two incompatible aspects of the symbol are inseparable. The inevitable result is that the more the poet tries to exalt the spirit of his friend in imagination, the more distant and inaccessible he seems. Imagination fails, in other words; yet there is no source of support besides. Shall the poet admit that his cherished personal idea of communion with the divine is an aberration? It has been his only real hope. Shall he, on the other hand, set himself up as a prophet? The attempt is self-defeating: he would be repudiated both by heaven—the heaven of his own creating—and earth alike.

He has only one recourse, aside from some form of escape: he must, without repudiating the desire embodied in the speculations about Arthur's heavenly existence, admit his inability to transform that dream into reality; and he must, without subscribing to the beliefs of his age, humbly accept kinship with his fellow men. He must admit that for all he can do or all his world can show him, reunion with Arthur remains only a consoling fancy and the habitual form of a faint trust in "the larger hope." All this he does, and the result is that the inspiration no longer sought is after all received. What is thus dramatically adumbrated, of course, is the concept of grace.

The elegy may still be seen as being divided into the four sections marked off by the three Christmas poems. The first section (1-27) deals with the conflict between the poet's sense of the profound significance of his reaction to loss on the one hand, and on the other the appeal of conventional agencies of consolation, represented partly by the tradition of the pastoral elegy, which is recognized in various ways. This conflict culminates in the decision to cherish the inspiration of grief, however impious such an attitude may seem. The tracing of the return of the ship with Hallam's body defines in an appropriately shadowy way the form of his deepest desire. In the second section (28-77), then, the poet, timid but faithful to his resolve, allows himself to speculate imaginatively on the subject of life after death; the Christmas poems both announce the theme and establish

the fact he has eschewed, though not irreverently, accepted forms of spiritual comfort. In the next eleven lyrics, after coping with inevitable misgivings (37), he proceeds more and more boldly and hopefully. Then comes a sudden disavowal (48), an uncertain apology (49), and finally a desperate cry from the depths: "Be near me when my light is low" (50). This celebrated lyric marks a turning point. Thenceforth to the end of the section, the poet is mainly concerned with the repudiation of his deepest hope. Again and again he denies his power of vision. "My words are only words," he says, "and move / Upon the topmost froth of thought" (52). He does not dare console himself with an imagined indulgent reassurance from his friend; to do so might encourage dangerous rationalizing:

Hold thou good, define it well;  
For fear divine Philosophy  
Should push beyond her mark, and be  
Procuress to the Lords of Hell. (53)

He is "an infant crying in the night," with "no language but a cry" (54). He falters when he attempts to discover the secret meaning in Nature's deeds (55) and admits that to science's description of Nature "red in tooth and claw" he as poet can only answer that all hope is "behind the veil" (56). In words that fall "like echoes in sepulchral halls, / As drop by drop the water falls / In vaults and catacombs," he bids farewell to his friend (57, 58), and asserts that if he is to be wedded to Sorrow, she must assume a more commonplace appearance. When he dwells on the possible state of his friend, as he continues to do, he emphasizes the great gulf that now separates them. Only in dreams and the revery of half-sleep does the old hope reassert itself (67-71). Significantly, this series comes immediately after the lyric in which he likens himself to an idle blind man (66) and is followed by the description of the ominous stormy dawn of the anniversary of Hallam's death, a day "marked as with some hideous crime." Finally he renounces even the attempt to celebrate in poetry the virtues of Arthur living (75)—because he has no faith in "modern rime."<sup>9</sup> Christmas is observed in a spirit of resignation (78).

<sup>9</sup>It is interesting to note Professor Sonn's observation concerning some of the expressions of doubt about the value of the poems (5, 29, 34, 36, 37, 38, 43, 76, and 77): "They are a background not only to the sections of intractable grief and intense doubt but also to those in which the poet seems to find solace and a manner of certainty. They indicate, therefore, the superficiality of this earlier solace and certainty; they attest to Tennyson's need for the deeper self-realization which would produce both an assured poetic vision and a degree of religious conviction." *Op. cit.*, pp. 92-93. What Professor Sonn

Near the end of the section the first bitterness of renunciation begins to give way to "the low beginnings of content," and it is the mood thus described that dominates the first part of the third section of the elegy (78-103). It is most important to perceive, however, that the movement toward the climax of lyric 95 is not an unbroken one. As in the second section, there is a crucial change of attitude. The increasing cheerfulness that marks most of the first eleven lyrics (79-89) is different from the surge of excitement that runs through lyrics 90-95 and from the deep assurance of the following eight. The reason is that the poet is at first determined to replace the passion for transcendent communion in the present with unrepining acceptance of mundane communion, insofar as it lies within his power to do so. He can fancy that Arthur himself would approve of the attempt. His attitude is very clearly expressed in the lyric addressed to Edmund Lushington:

My old affection of the tomb,  
A part of stillness, yearns to speak:  
'Arise, and get thee forth and seek  
A friendship for the years to come.

'I watch thee from the quiet shore;  
Thy spirit up to mine can reach;  
But in dear words of human speech  
We two communicate no more.'

And I, 'Can clouds of nature stain  
The starry clearness of the free?  
How is it? Canst thou feel for me  
Some painless sympathy with pain?'

And lightly does the whisper fall:  
'T is hard for thee to fathom this;  
I triumph in conclusive bliss,  
And that serene result of all.'

*So hold I commerce with the dead;  
Or so methinks the dead would say;  
Or so shall grief with symbols play  
And pining life be fancy-fed.*

Now looking to some settled end,  
That these things pass, and I shall prove  
A meeting somewhere, love with love,  
I crave your pardon, O my friend;

---

omits to note is that the earlier passages are primarily expressions of desire, while those in the middle portion of the poem are in the nature of repudiations.

If not so fresh, with love as true,  
I, clasping brother-hands, aver  
I could not, if I would, transfer  
The whole I felt for him to you.

For which be they that hold apart  
The promise of the golden hours?  
First love, first friendship, equal powers,  
That marry with the virgin heart.

Still mine, that cannot but deplore,  
That beats within a lonely place,  
That yet remembers his embrace,  
But at his footstep leaps no more,

My heart, tho' widow'd, may not rest  
Quite in the love of what is gone,  
But seeks to beat in time with one  
That warms another living breast.

Ah, take the imperfect gift I bring,  
Knowing the primrose yet is dear,  
The primrose of the later year,  
As not unlike to that of Spring. (85 [*Italics mine*])

He can now entertain thoughts of Arthur without disquiet; it is merely upon the praises of Arthur as a creature of earth that he dwells, however.

But his sincere renunciation is to have a more profound effect. Almost at once, in fact, appear signs of intimations of the great experience to come: there is an *unaccountable* excitement in the famous lyric 86, and he is stirred in spite of himself by the symbolism of the beauty of the nightingale's song (88). At last the welling up of hope—not to be confused with “the low beginnings of content”—finds expression in the appeal of lyric 90:

Ah, dear, but come thou back to me!  
Whatever change the years have wrought,  
I find not yet one lonely thought  
That cries against my wish for thee.

Yet in spite of his excitement, he strives to remain passive; though he may not wholly understand why it should be so, he is well aware that the new hope has been made possible only by his acceptance of defeat.

Thus Bradley's schematization has obscured the existence of what might be called the most crucial development in the progress of the poet's soul from the profound shock of grief to the state of serene

and fruitful faith—that development involving crucial commitment, decisive failure, and unequivocal acceptance of defeat. Professor Carr's emphasis on the observance of "the pastoral ritual of the year" that underlines the "comparative superficial time-scheme of three years"<sup>10</sup> is helpful, for the major development in question might be said to begin after the doubtful spring of the first year and end with the true spring of the following year. However, the poet uses the pastoral ritual, like the Christmas theme, only to adumbrate an experience the value of which depends partly on its personal and unique—though not wholly unshareable—character. Because of readers' predilections, the conventional elements in the poem have concealed as much as they have revealed. The poet's own fidelity to actual experience has also made the poem more difficult: the Icarus-like character of the first flight of fancy is somewhat obscured by sincere expressions of misgiving that seem to be pious disavowals. Once discerned, however, the pattern becomes more and more clearly apparent in all its complexity.

University of Oklahoma

J. L. KENDALL

## The Meaning of Browning's Ring-Figure

Since the publication in 1908 of Hodell's translation of *The Old Yellow Book*, there has been almost unanimous disapproval of Browning's ring-figure as an analogy of the composition of *The Ring and the Book*. "Browning presses his figure too far," it is said. "The fancy or imagination of the poet, which is the jeweller's alloy in shaping the ring, does not, happily 'fly off in fume' in the poem, but remains as the most essential part of the poem" (*A Browning Handbook*, N. Y., 1955, p. 330). So runs the authoritative view, ratified here by Professor DeVane. Although few students of the poem are able to say that the figure is consistent with the facts, there is nevertheless reason to believe that perhaps the critics and not Browning have pressed it too far—have expected too much of a metaphor. It is surprising that such an uncompromising insistence upon the priority of imagination in Books II-XII of the poem does not extend to Book I, or at least to the several hundred lines of that book which

<sup>10</sup> Op. cit., p. 380.



are pertinent to the aesthetics of the poem. Yet critics have regarded the ring-figure itself not as poetry, but as prose statement, as language and meaning which is fixed and self-contained, and which can be lifted from its context for analysis. Browning, of course, was aware of the double difficulty of making an explicit statement about the creative act in language the very nature of which is to be conditioned by its context. If, then, we wish to understand his statement, we must consider his efforts to control and even to exploit the relations of the ring-figure to its context and to the larger structure of the first book of the poem.

An illustration of one such effort may be found early in the book in an interesting correspondence between the language with which Browning describes the "untempered gold" of his ring and the "untampered" fact of his poem. Although the analogy of gold and fact, here suggested by the similarity of their two modifiers, is first made explicit only at ll. 141-144 ("Now, as the ingot, ere the ring was forged, / Lay gold . . . / So, in this book lay absolutely truth, / Fanciless fact"), it should be noted that the basis of this analogy is established by the parallelism of the first line of the first verse paragraph ("Do you see this Ring?") and the first line of the second verse paragraph ("Do you see this square old yellow Book"). In the former, the ring metal is described as

oozings from the mine,  
Virgin as oval tawny pendent tear  
At beehive-edge when ripened combs o'erflow. (I. 11-13)

Browning obviously has honey in mind, and although that image is used to suggest the softness and richness of "slivers of pure gold," it is on closer examination rather unusual for that purpose; "oozings," "tear," and "o'erflow" suggest something indeterminate and spontaneous, more appropriate to animate than to inanimate matter. Notice, then, that in the second verse paragraph, Browning speaks of "pure crude fact" as that which is

Secreted from man's life when hearts beat hard,  
And brains, high-blooded, ticked. . . . (I. 36-37)

I shall not insist that Browning is saying that the materials of poetry are "secreted" from men's lives as gold "oozes" from the ground, or honey from the hive. But if we bear in mind the parallelism of the two verse paragraphs in which these passages are found, it appears not unlikely that he is trying to suggest an analogy between the natural

processes which produce gold and honey and the vital relation of fact to experience. Time and the elements have driven gold to the surface of the earth, the ceaseless activities of bees have caused their combs to overflow with honey: and so the beating hearts and ticking brains of men have produced facts. It is for this reason that *The Old Yellow Book* was somehow "restorative / I' the touch and sight."

As the extant remains of human experience, facts are therefore an important constituent of poetry, and it will shortly be seen in what way this interpretation affects the meaning of the ring-figure. It is first necessary to consider Browning's distinction between fact and truth, for this too has some bearing on that meaning. After summarizing the contents of *The Old Yellow Book*, he asks: "Was this the truth of force? / Able to take its own part as truth should, / Sufficient, self-sustaining?" (I. 372-74) Thus stated, the difference between fact and truth is one not necessarily of kind, but of degree. The test of sufficiency is a test of time, the test also of art. Browning answers this question negatively, and by means of a figure which emphasizes the loss of that aspect of fact the restoration of which, in art, the ring-figure is customarily interpreted to signify—the loss of the particularities of experience, the matter on which poetry depends for its content. In "a little while," he says, "the passage of a century or so," Oblivion goes home with her harvest, "And all left smooth again as scythe could shave" (I. 417-21). At the instant of its birth, the life of fact begins to die. Like Guido's crime, which hung like a rocket "full of fame / Over men's upturned faces, ghastly thence," the historical act "once seen, grows what is now described, / Then talked of, told about, a tinge the less / In every fresh transmission" (XII. 2-16). Man's "primal curse" is his inability to maintain this light; like the "squinting" Other Half-Rome, he can only "meditate the mode of brightness."

Moreover, not only are the particulars of the life for which facts stand lost in time, but the form of that life, the idea or motive behind human actions is lost. As the former was expressed in an image of a smooth-shaven field of grain, the loss of form—that quality which should make an indisputable fact "plain and pillar-like"—is expressed in an image of architectural ruin: "Base gone, shaft lost, only entablature, / Dwindled into no bigger than a book, / Lay of the column" (I. 670-72). Art, then, is a re-presentation of life or truth through the agency of the incomplete and formless records which that life has produced. The poet must recognize the life for which

the facts stand, "calculate . . . the lost proportions of the style," and attempt to restore that life. As the jeweler "binds the loose, one bar without a break" and engraves the surface of a ring with a "lilied loveliness," so the poet must seek the motives of actions, "the informing thought," at the same time restoring to them the dramatic elements of narrative.

Browning describes the process by which the artist performs these two functions in the ring-figure. "To bear the file's tooth and the hammer's tap: / Since hammer needs must widen out the round, / And file emboss it fine," the jeweler must mingle "gold / With gold's alloy"; he thus "effects a manageable mass, then works" (I. 14-21). Then "there's repristination":

Just a spirt  
O' the proper fiery acid o'er its face,  
And forth the alloy unfastened flies in fume;  
While, self-sufficient now, the shape remains,  
Gold as it was, is, shall be evermore:  
Prime nature with an added artistry—  
No carat lost, and you have gained a ring. (I. 23-30)

The final lines of this passage express the view of art which we have just established, an art which attempts to make its materials substantial and enduring, and which exists as an autonomy equivalent to the life which produced these materials. But what of the repristination of the amalgam mentioned in the earlier lines? It is a commonplace of aesthetics that no element of an artistic whole can be isolated from that whole, and that any objective or subjective element which enters into the composition of an art work remains an immutable part of it. Yet, in explaining what were the constituents of the poem, Browning says:

This was it from, my fancy with those facts,  
Which, wrought into a shapely ring therewith,  
Hammered and filed, fingered and favoured, last  
Lay ready for the renovating wash  
O' the water. "How much of the tale was true?"  
I disappeared. (I.679-87)

According to Mr. Paul Cundiff, once we know that the process which Browning is talking about is merely a means of removing impurities from the surface of a ring, we realize that "Browning would have us think that he similarly removed himself from the FACE of the poem." "He restored to the surface of the poem a pure narrative of the book

[*The Old Yellow Book*], knowing that his 'fancy' had contributed to the interior structure."<sup>1</sup> Thus interpreted, "repristination" is nothing more than an analogy of the manipulation of point of view, for it is by assigning the task of narration to various *dramatis personae* that Browning is able to "remove himself from the FACE of the poem." But Browning refers here not only to the content of the poem, the "lilied loveliness" which is its narrative surface. He is speaking as well of the form of the poem, the "rondure brave"—or better, of the poet's handling of content and form as the single act which he knew it to be, the act of creation, not composition. In distinguishing between the form and content of the poem, Mr. Cundiff overlooks a more important distinction implicit in his own interpretation, that between a "fancy" which fused itself with the facts of *The Old Yellow Book* and an "I" which disappeared from this fusion, a distinction between a subjective alter ego which identified itself with the life behind the fact and an objective ego which recorded that life.

To find our way out of this difficulty, we must return to Browning's interpretation of the basic ingredient of art—gold in the ring, fact in poetry. To convey the notion of the vital nature of these materials, Browning employed imagery depicting the generation of honey by bees. It is important now to notice that in describing the "alloy" of gold, he returns to this imagery: "the artificer," he says, "melts up wax / With honey, so to speak" (I. 18-19). The alloy is similar in kind to the basic material; since honey has certain organic relations to life, we may infer that Browning means that the alloy "wax" also exhibits these relations.

May fact be similarly related to its alloy, fancy? Imagination (the term is, for Browning, equivalent to "fancy") has, of course, an origin different from fact, and Browning has clearly acknowledged "fancy" as "something of mine." What, then, does he mean by saying that "fancy with fact is just one fact the more"? He says:

To-wit, that fancy has informed, transpierced,  
Thridded and so thrown fast the facts else free,  
As right through ring and ring runs the djereed  
And binds the loose, one bar without a break. (I. 464-68)

One is tempted to speculate that in the last three lines Browning is trying to suggest alliteratively the identity of, yet difference between, "fact" and "fancy": that is, by juxtaposing a line making use of

<sup>1</sup> Paul A. Cundiff, "The Clarity of Browning's Ring Metaphor," *PMLA*, LXIII (1948), 1276.

two different, though related, sounds, *th* and *f* ("Thridded and so thrown fast the facts else free") against two lines, the sounds in which, *r* and *b*, are contrasting ("... right through ring and ring runs the djereed," and "binds ... one bar without a break"). But there is a more obvious justification of the statement that "fancy with fact is just one fact the more." This is the correspondence between fancy and a quality of the substance to which Browning likened the alloy of gold, "wax." Like the latter, fancy is conceived of as a plastic substance, able to inform and bind the loose, "one bar without a break"; and although it is distinct from the vital principle which makes wax the "alloy" of honey, the fancy, by virtue of its plasticity, is able to approximate or realize any vital principle or action. The "fancy" allowed Browning to have his will with the facts (I, 778), enabled him to conceive imaginatively and as a formal unity the life of which, in response to the facts alone, he had only a vague intuition.

This aspect of creation is dramatically demonstrated in Browning's account of his actual experience with the materials of the poem. "I fused my live soul and that inert stuff," he says, "before attempting smithcraft" or actual composition (I. 469-70); the essential poem, "my fancy with those facts," already existed in Browning's mind as he paced the terrace of Casa Guidi, mulling over the facts of *The Old Yellow Book*. At the end of this long reflective passage (ll. 476-678), he remarks: "such alloy, / Such substance of me interfused the gold ... / Lay ready for the renovating wash / O' the water. ... / I disappeared" (I. 681-87). To the extent that it was the "fancy" only which entered into this fusion, Browning, the objective self, had "disappeared" from the amalgam. The terrace passage vividly draws this distinction between the ego and the alter ego by exploiting their respective functions of objective observation and subjective identification. These lines begin with a minutely detailed description of Browning's immediate surroundings at Casa Guidi:

The book was shut and done with and laid by  
On the cream-coloured massive agate, broad  
'Neath the twin cherubs in the tarnished frame  
O'the mirror, tall thence to the celing-top. (I. 472-75)

There follow more details of the Felice Church and the Florentine summer night. Such description is not mere virtuosity. In giving us an exact picture of his physical surroundings, Browning is attempting to locate and fix himself on a particular balcony in Florence, while his fancy flies back to Guido and Pompilia in Arezzo and Rome.

"From the reading," he says, "I turned, to free myself and find the world," imaginatively traveling "Out of the Roman gate to the Roman road . . . till I *felt* the Apennine. . . . *Feeling* my way on through the hot and dense, / Romeward" (I. 478-507. My italics).

The jeweler's repristination of the amalgamated ring is, then, only an approximate analogy of the creative process of the poet. The poet's fancy is actually not separated from the poem; moreover, what repristination that does occur, in a roughly equivalent way, occurs before the poem is written down. But in the release of the spiritual fancy from the corporeal poet, there is something akin to the concept of "repristination"—or, in more current terms, "depersonalization"—which Browning wishes to suggest with the ring figure.

Russell Sage College

GEORGE R. WASSERMAN

## Lawrence's Non-Human Analogues

In Chapter VI of *The Rainbow*, where Lawrence is largely concerned with the conflict between the recently married Will and Anna Brangwen, there is a well known scene in which two blue-caps squabbling in the cottage garden reflect the state of affairs between husband and wife.<sup>1</sup> These blue-caps are the kind of non-human analogues to which my title refers and I quote them as an example of a symbolic correspondence that no reader would be likely to dispute. Occasionally it is impossible to decide whether Lawrence was aware of the analogical function of what appears to be a casually introduced bird or animal, but usually there is no difficulty since the analogues are either so pointed in their application that one must assume an awareness on his part, as with the blue-caps, or they are so inconspicuous that they must have appeared to him as details belonging wholly to the natural setting. There are also occasions when a correspondence between human and non-human is open and acknowledged, as for instance in Chapter XIII of *Women in Love*, where two cats present in dumb show in Birkin's garden a parody of the relationship that the latter wants to establish with Ursula. Not only do the human pair watch the cats through the window—it is remarkable, incidentally, how often these analogues are perceived through windows by the people to whom they relate—but they also discuss the parallel.

<sup>1</sup> See E. L. Nicholes's note on bird symbols in *The Rainbow* in *The Achievement of D. H. Lawrence*, ed. F. J. Hoffman and H. T. Moore (Norman, 1953).



The analogues that I am concerned with in this note are all of my second type, those that Lawrence probably did not recognise as such at the time of writing. They can be described as 'given' material, as formulations in terms of birds and beasts (and sometimes of flowers) which may anticipate, modify, or replace discursive analysis and one learns to expect them especially at moments of stress or illumination. This is not to say that the analogues are always recognisable at a first reading. They may then be no more than what Professor W. Y. Tindall calls 'attendant images . . . that give body to narrative,' not yet having reached that degree of familiarity where they are capable of 'teasing our understanding by non-discursive relationship with what surrounds them.'<sup>2</sup> When one reads for the first time in the opening description of March and Banford's farm in 'The Fox' that one of their two heifers refused to be confined within their fences, one has no means, at that early stage, of anticipating an identification; it is only at a later reading that one realises that the heifer that insists on breaking out is to be equated with March and the stay-at-home with Banford. Similarly, it is only when one has given full weight to Paul Morel's sense of his mother's obstinacy in clinging to life that one understands the significance of the affectionate donkey that makes up to him when he takes a country walk in an interval away from the sick-room:

But she did not consent to die; she would not. . . . Paul went through the country, through the woods, over the snow. He wandered miles and miles. A smoky red sunset came on slowly, painfully, lingering. He thought she would die that day. There was a donkey that came up to him over the snow by the wood's edge, and put its head against him, and walked with him alongside. He put his arms around the donkey's neck, and stroked his cheeks against his ears.

His mother, silent, was still alive, with her hard mouth gripped grimly, her eyes of dark torture only living.<sup>3</sup>

The simple poignancy of this scene, where the lingering sunset and the proverbially obstinate donkey repeat in other terms the situation that is still waiting for Paul at home, has, by the way, a complement in *Women in Love*. When Gudrun tells Winifred Crich that her father is dying, the latter not only says, 'I don't believe he will,' but also draws attention to a dam that she has made to hold back a little stream of water, as if to prevent him from dying.

One would expect unrecognized analogues to appear most often in

<sup>2</sup> W. Y. Tindall, *The Literary Symbol* (Bloomington, 1955), p. 117.

<sup>3</sup> *Sons and Lovers*, Chapter XIV.

the course of episodes where Lawrence is most deeply and, in a sense, self-forgetfully engaged. There is some confirmation for this view in the fact that there are scarcely any in *The Trespasser* and *The Lost Girl*, two of the most impersonal and 'deliberate' of the novels. Nevertheless, there are here and there, in stories and episodes where Lawrence is not closely involved, analogues worth noting, some of them accidentally comic. The prickly attractiveness of Captain Hepburn, for instance, is repeated by the flowering cactus that stands in his room, the alien presence of Aaron Sisson in Milan cathedral by a white dog that trots through the nave, and the sympathy between Ramón and Cipriano by two birds flying side by side. It is only too easy, of course, to concentrate on a novel until any external detail takes on significance. When this happens one can occasionally find confirmation of the significance elsewhere, as we shall see in connection with an episode in *Sons and Lovers*, although usually one can do no more than toy with a possibility. A case in point would be the short paragraph near the beginning of 'Sun' where Juliet's establishing herself in Sicily is described:

And though the Atlantic was grey as lava, she did come at last into the sun. Even she had a house above the bluest of seas, with a vast garden, or vineyard, all vines and olives dropping steeply, terrace after terrace, to the strip of coast plain; and the garden full of secret places, deep groves of lemon far down in the cleft of the earth, and hidden pure green reservoirs of water; then a spring issuing out of a little cavern, where the old Sicules had drunk before the Greeks came; and a grey goat bleating, stabled in an empty tomb, with all the niches empty. There was the scent of mimosa, and beyond, the snow of the volcano.<sup>4</sup>

One's first response to the grey goat is to regard it as a petty symbol of sexuality and the life of instinct, appropriate enough to this garden full of secret places and to the Laurentian pre-classical past. The scent of mimosa, which is strongly associated with the renewal of happiness and the free individual life in the closing pages of *Kangaroo*, could be taken as reinforcing this first impression by connecting it with Juliet's present situation. What gives one pause, even if one neglects the tomb and its empty niches, which could have far-reaching implications of their own, is the greyness of the goat and its being shut up. (In this story 'grey' means 'sunless,' 'out of touch with the vivifying sun.' Juliet's husband, when he eventually arrives, stands 'grey-faced, in his grey felt hat and his dark grey suit, at a loss

<sup>4</sup> *The Tales of D. H. Lawrence* (London, 1934), p. 741.

among the vine terraces'). Are we to suppose that the grey goat which has lost its liberty suggests a sexuality that is closely regulated and only precariously alive? And does it refer to Juliet, who in the last resort is the prisoner of her marriage, or to her husband, who has 'the gold-grey eyes of an animal that has been caught young, and reared completely in captivity'? These are the possibilities that one toys with till one checks their proliferation on what one hopes is still this side of absurdity. But even if the goat cannot be exclusively assigned to Juliet or to her husband, one can be almost sure of its straightforward sexual implication, for Lawrence's analogical beasts always have their proverbial attributes.

My example of an analogue that appears to be confirmed elsewhere comes from Chapter IX of *Sons and Lovers* ('Defeat of Miriam'). It follows a well-known scene in which Paul has attacked Miriam for fondling some daffodils and has charged her, in his usual way, with never liking things without clutching them as if she wanted to pull the heart out of them:

After tea he stayed with Edgar and the brothers, taking no notice of Miriam. She, extremely unhappy on this looked-for holiday, waited for him. And at last he yielded and came to her. She was determined to track this mood of his to its origin. She counted it not much more than a mood.

"Shall we go through the wood a little way?" she asked him, knowing he never refused a direct request.

They went down to the warren. On the middle path they passed a trap, a narrow horseshoe hedge of small fir-boughs, baited with the guts of a rabbit. Paul glanced at it frowning. She caught his eye.

"Isn't it dreadful?" she asked.

"I don't know! Is it worse than a weasel with its teeth in a rabbit's throat? One weasel or many rabbits? One or the other must go!"

He was taking the bitterness of life badly. She was rather sorry for him.

The essential detail is the weasel trap. In what may be described as its rationalized context, the rabbit warren, it is entirely plausible, but it is not a random detail belonging only to the setting. When one takes into account Lawrence's deep-seated fear of heterosexual love except on terms that excluded the possibility of capture and submission, one is perhaps justified in equating the trap with Miriam, the bait with physical relations, and the prospective victim with Paul. Confirmation for this reading, if confirmation it is, comes on the penultimate page of the novel, at the lovers' final parting, when Paul is explicitly identified as a weasel who will escape from Miriam, and Miriam herself is seen, as before, fondling spring flowers:

He moved about the room with a certain sureness of touch, swift and relentless and quiet. She knew she could not cope with him. He would escape like a weasel out of her hands. . . . Brooding she touched the flowers.

The same type of trap is mentioned in the opening lines of Chapter V of *The White Peacock* and there too it is associated with a growing awareness of 'the bitterness of life.' If it were not for the positive Paul-weasel identification at the end of *Sons and Lovers* one might be satisfied with this surface meaning that Lawrence offers.

Occasionally an analogue carries a value judgment that is not so positively made in other terms. There are situations in *Kangaroo* where the unfamiliar birds and animals appear to comment on Somers's shifting attitudes to Kangaroo and the Diggers, and there are comparable situations in *The Plumed Serpent* when Kate Leslie's indecisions about identifying herself with the Quetzalcoatl movement cannot be resolved, but the example most likely to carry conviction occurs in *Aaron's Rod* at the point where Aaron is about to give way to his brief infatuation for the Marchesa del Torre, in spite of his terror of feminine exactions. ('Cost what may, he must come to her. And yet he knew at the same time that, cost what may, he must keep the power to recover himself from her'). Although there are indications that Lawrence himself was rather dazzled by the Marchesa and too impressed by 'the thunder of the male passion-power' in Aaron, there is one piece of evidence that he unwittingly saw Aaron's embroilment simply as the act of a fool. On the morning when Aaron has resolved to present himself as a lover he gazes across the river at the Marchesa's apartment:

As soon as it was really light, he rose, and opened his window wide. It was a grey, slow morning. But he saw neither the morning nor the river nor the woman walking on the gravel river-bed with her goose, nor the green hill up to San Miniato. He watched the tuft of palm-trees and the terrace beside it. . . . Motionless, planted, he stood and watched the terrace across the Arno.

There is a strong presumption that Aaron is to be equated with the goose and the Marchesa with its keeper, even though one cannot suppose that Lawrence would have consciously agreed to such an unqualified judgment on Aaron as that.

My last example of the particular kind of symbolic detail that I am concerned with comes from *The Plumed Serpent*, a novel crowded with symbolic detail of more than one kind, contrived and otherwise. It occurs in Chapter XIII ('The First Rain'), which is largely taken

up with a ceremony of Ramón's that precedes the first storm of the rainy season. Before the ceremony there is a passage, essential for the recognition of the analogues when they eventually appear, where Ramón fumes against Carlota and Kate for their resistance, in their different ways and degrees, to the development of his theocracy:

Ramón got up and walked away. The sun had set, the night was falling. And in his soul the great, writhing anger was alive again. Carlota provoked it into life. The two women seemed to breathe life into the black monster of his inward rage. . . . His people would betray him, he knew that. Cipriano would betray him. Given one little vulnerable chink, they would pierce him. They would leap at the place out of nowhere, like a tarantula, and bite in the poison.

Kate's antipathy to the Quetzalcoatl movement is that of a European who cannot as yet tolerate a diminution of her independence, whereas Carlota's is that of a Catholic appalled by the success of a heresy, but they are alike in being will-driven women who cannot acknowledge the primacy of the male. Ramón's imputation that Cipriano will betray him can be discounted; the full extent of their difference is that the latter wants to divert the revolution to political ends and it is much less serious than that of the women. How serious that animosity is appears some ten pages later when the ceremony has ended and the rain has begun:

Down came the rain with a smash, as if some great vessel had broken. . . . Kate watched the dropping masses of water in wonder. Already, in the blue moments of lightning, she saw the garden below a pond, the walks were rushing rivers. It was cold. She turned indoors.

A servant was going round the rooms with a lantern, to look if scorpions were coming out. He found one scuttling across the floor of Kate's room, and one fallen from the ceiling beams onto Carlota's bed.

They sat in the *salon* in rocking chairs, Carlota and Kate, and rocked.

The women are to be identified, it seems, with the scorpions that are found in their bedrooms and nowhere else. What appears to have happened is that the poisonous stinging creatures of my first quotation, the tarantulas to which Ramón likens his enemies in general, have been replaced by the 'real' externalized scorpions of my second quotation, and their reference is now restricted to the two women, the principal enemies. Here again, as with the Aaron-geese identification, we have a value judgment all the more positive for not being admitted and elaborated.

The kind of analogue that I have been discussing is, of course,

quite trivial in comparison with a large-scale symbolic episode in, say, *The Rainbow* or *Women in Love*. One wonders, in fact, if it would not be better if the former kind remained unrecognized, as no more than Tindall's 'attendant images,' or whether one could have, at most, merely an unresolved sense of their being meaningful without proceeding to work out correspondences. But in practice one cannot stop there, and the reward for going on is a sense that one is still 'with' the novelist when subject and setting are aspects of a total meaning. Lawrence, who in *Apocalypse* deplored the working out of symbolic correspondences with the remark 'Explanations are our doom' at the same time as he speculated about them himself, would have been doubtful about all such critical explorations.

University of Liverpool

RAYMOND WRIGHT

## Comic Intent in Poe's Tales: Five Criteria

The interpretation of Poe's tales as art-structures, a task still largely to be accomplished, will depend in part on an acceptable classification. None of the efforts put forth so far are quite satisfactory. James Southall Wilson in "The Devil Was in It" [*American Mercury*, XXIV (October, 1931), 215-20] has taken the soundest approach to the problem. The comic, he suggests, is the basic consideration. Apart from the possibility that Poe was never serious, one suspects that almost half of the tales may be read legitimately as satire, farce, burlesque, or extravaganza. Many tales hitherto interpreted in the light of "the tragic vision" should be reviewed. Once the question of the comic is settled, other questions become less difficult to deal with. By way of a beginning, the following criteria, derived from a selection of motifs in all the tales, are offered as rough rules for classification.

(1) Poe's intentions can be determined not so much by the kind of motif that he uses, as the way he directs the motif, whether in *ascending* or *descending* motion. The flight upward—as in, for example, "The Balloon Hoax," "The Devil in the Belfry," "Hop Frog," "Metzengerstein," and "Mellonta Tauta"—appears uniformly to reveal comic intentions. The hero, frequently an embodiment of the *eiron*, the little character from the old Greek comedy whose name



still exists etymologically in our word *irony*, by his own wit and ratiocinative skill often escapes the machinations of his adversaries and lives, presumably, to practise his hoaxes another day. Tales in this category expose everything from "human perfectibility men" to American materialism, self-induced fraud, and a vice-president of the United States.

Descending motion, on the other hand, reveals except in a few instances the complexities of the *liebestod* motif, as in "The Fall of the House of Usher," "Ligeia," "Morella," and "The Oblong Box"; or the ratiocinative aspects of self-preservation, as seen in "A Descent into the Maelström" and "The Pit and the Pendulum." Horizontal motion, for example in the maze ("The Man of the Crowd," "William Wilson"), likewise indicates seriousness and complexity.

(2) *Group-action* is always a clue to comic intent. Some of Poe's most successful humor appears in his satiric pictures of a society bent on party-going, public competitions, and scientific exploits. Examples are "Four Beasts in One," a social and political satire; "King Pest," a social and literary satire; "Lionizing," a social and literary satire; and "Hans Pfaall," a satire on science.

(3) *Machine-motions*, as of automata, reveal comic intent. Poe presents these motions in various ways: through physical deformity, as for example in "Hop-Frog"; the wearing of artificial physical members, "The Man That Was Used Up"; ponderous animal disguises, "Four Beasts in One"; the application of electricity, "Some Words with a Mummy"; and the insertion of a mechanical device into a corpse to make it appear to be alive, "Thou Art the Man." Machine-motions and automata, as will have been observed, may frequently be linked with group-action as a criterion. This device is one of Poe's most telling in the depiction of a society that is actually moribund but proceeds, out of habit, to perform social and political rituals long after they have ceased to have much meaning.

(4) *Structural proportion and avoidance of proportion* show, respectively, serious and comic intent. When Poe's theories of unity and of effect, for example, are seen to be well realized, the reader may generally conclude that Poe has given a good deal of care to the story, wishing it to imitate structurally his idea of cosmological unity as put forth in *Eureka*. Examples to be noted are "The Masque of the Red Death" and "The Cask of Amontillado." Avoidance of proportion, on the other hand, may be taken to represent a deliberate imitation of "ontological" deformity; non-sequitur constructions,

ignoratio-elenchi constructions, and loosely episodic constructions are varieties of the type. Examples are "How to Write a Blackwood Article," "A Predicament," and "The Business Man."

(5) The *devil* as a character is invariably a signal of the comic. In this respect, Poe is in the main stream of American humor, which is noted for presenting the native as an eiron who through superior astuteness in plotting is able to outwit the forces of supernatural evil. Bargaining or competing in games with the devil is generally depicted in structures that are less carefully designed, more nearly extemporaneous, and occasionally quite impromptu in quality—a reflection of the rapid changes of strategy sometimes required of a character in dealing with the devil. God as a character in Poe would be entirely out of place, but the devil—as in much American literature—is a familiar and charming visitor in his fictional world. Poe's devil-farces are "The Duc de l'Omelette," "Bon-Bon," and "The Devil in the Belfry."

*The University of Tennessee*

STEPHEN L. MOONEY

## Hemingway's Other Style

On the surface Hemingway's prose is hard and bare, secular and insistently non-literary. This observation is such a commonplace it would be inexcusable to repeat it at this late date except as a sounding board for observations of a very different order. Its purpose here is to serve as a starting point for examining passages written in an opposing style—warmly human, richly allusive, and at least suggestive of spiritual values. They are indeed rare, but they are usually crucial. And much of their effectiveness comes from contextual contrast with the prevailing mode in which Hemingway's fictions are written—the "purified," stripped, athletic prose for which he has long been famous. Undue admiration for this, as if simplicity were somehow superior to complexity in literature, has tended to make critics neglect his other style. Further, these lyric passages are so submerged beneath the tough exterior that many readers have overlooked them altogether.

A close look at one example, the brief dream sequence during the retreat from Caporetto in *A Farewell to Arms*,<sup>1</sup> will illustrate both

<sup>1</sup> For convenience the edition in Scribner's "Modern Standard Authors" series is used. Page references are given in parentheses in the text, following each quotation or citation.

the technique and the function of such passages. It comes in Chapter 28 at the main turning point in the narrative. For what began as an orderly retreat quickly degenerates into a rout, and by the end of Chapter 30, in the chaos at the Tagliamento River crossing, Lieutenant Henry has deserted from the Italian army. War, the first theme of the book, drops out from this point on and the second theme, love, emerges as the dominant one. This has been amply prepared for in the chapters just prior to the dream sequence, and they must now be combed for the threads that are woven by sleep into such a richly symbolic fabric.

In Chapter 23 during the hero's convalescence from battle wounds, at the base hospital in Milan, his love for Catherine Barkley had first matured and ripened. It reached a climax on his last evening before returning to the front, when the lovers found their only available rendezvous in a cheap hotel opposite the railroad station. For the first few minutes, depressed by the tawdry surroundings, her spirits sank: "I never felt like a whore before," she said (158). But refreshed by a dinner of woodcock and wine, and renewed by love's feast, she decided that the red plush and mirrors were just right. He summed it up: "We felt very happy and in a little time the room felt like our own home. My room at the hospital had been our own home . . . in the same way" (159). With a tenderness just concealed under the clipped surface, their talk turned to her pregnancy and the serious problem of bearing their child in a world dislocated by war. Her only lament was that they were never settled in their "home" very long, but she concluded characteristically with chin up: "I'll have a fine home for you when you come back" (162). War not only disrupts peace and the chances of domestic happiness, but makes more urgent the note of transiency as a threat to love. What really lifts the whole scene up is the very brief literary allusion, made by Lieutenant Henry in the midst of their talk:

But at my back I always hear  
Time's wingèd chariot hurrying near. (161)

This quotation from Marvell, enriching enough in itself, is made more complex by being strained through the ironic discords of its echo in Eliot's *Wasteland*, as has been recently pointed out.<sup>2</sup> At this high

<sup>2</sup> Donna Gerstenberger, "The Waste Land in *A Farewell to Arms*," *MLN*, LXXVI (1961), 24-25. It should be added, to complete the record, that Hemingway also echoes these lines at the end of the novel, just before Catherine's sudden death: "We knew the baby was very close now and it gave us both a feeling as though something were hurrying us and we could not lose any time together" (321).

point the tryst is broken abruptly by the arrival of the midnight train and the lovers are separated, in the rain.

Time is running out with the Italian defenses at the Austrian frontier too. On rejoining his corps, Henry finds the morale in a state of collapse, profanity and obscenity increasing with the general spread of war weariness. Though it is still autumn the winter rains have already set in, torrential and unending. Rain, a pervasive symbol throughout the novel for the depression and destruction of war, now becomes a deluge that washes away the resistance of the Italian army as it had previously eroded all the values of civilization. Less than a week after his return the combined German and Austrian forces launch a major offensive, the front gives way, and the long retreat begins. Since this is not a historical novel, the focus narrows to the three hospital cars under command of Lieutenant Henry. Their withdrawal is orderly at first, and the only two events that break the routine are seemingly trivial ones but pertinent to the present analysis: the comic evacuation of the soldiers' whorehouse at Gorizia on the first day (195), and the episode of the two young girls that occurs late that night (202), when the retreating column is stalled in the mud on the road to Udine. The driver of one of the hospital cars has given the adolescent sisters a ride and is playfully making passes at them. As they sob in terror he asks if they are virgins, and both nod their heads vigorously, "'Don't worry,' he said. 'No danger of ———,' using the vulgar word. 'No place for ———.' . . . Both the girls seemed cheered" (203). After witnessing this and deciding that all is well, Henry returns to his car and falls asleep.

This full rehearsal of the context in which the dream sequence takes place—bringing back to the reader's mind all he would be aware of when he had reached this point—has been necessary in order to show the dream's intricate relation to the main themes of the novel. Now for the passage itself:

It was still raining hard. . . . Those were a couple of fine fiirls with Barto. A retreat was no place for two virgins. Real virgins. Probably very religious. If there were no war we would probably all be in bed. In bed I lay me down my head. Bed and board. Stiff as a board in bed. Catherine was in bed now between two sheets, over her and under her. Which side did she sleep on? Maybe she wasn't asleep. Maybe she was lying thinking about me. Blow, blow, ye western wind. Well, it blew and it wasn't the small rain but big rain down that rained. It rained all night. You knew it rained down that rained. Look at it. Christ, that my love were in my arms and I in my bed again. That my love Catherine. That my sweet love Catherine down might rain. Blow her again to me. Well, we were in it. Every one was

caught in it and the small rain would not quiet it. "Good-night, Catherine," I said out loud. "I hope you sleep well. If it's too uncomfortable, darling, lie on the other side," I said "I'll get you some cold water. In a little while it will be morning and then it won't be so bad. I'm sorry he makes you so uncomfortable. Try and go to sleep, sweet." (204)

The dream device here adopted offers several advantages. Substantively, it affords the hero an escape from the horrors of war and reunion with his beloved, at least in spirit. Stylistically, it frees him from the requisite soldier talk, whether of bravura or nihilism, and permits a change of pace into tender, allusive, and lyrical language. Structurally, with the sprung syntax and free association of ideas characteristic of dreams, it justifies the author in abandoning the logic of prose for the indirection and symbolism of poetry. Hemingway takes full advantage of all these possibilities.

The key sentence in this passage, though written as prose, he undoubtedly expected the attentive reader to recognize as a direct quotation from an anonymous sixteenth-century lyric, "The Lover in Winter Plaineth for the Spring":

O Western wind, when wilt thou blow  
That the small rain down can rain?  
*Christ, that my love were in my arms*  
*And I in my bed again!*<sup>3</sup>

With this clue, which has passed unnoticed by previous critics, the complex significance of the paragraph begins to unfold. It opens with the pouring rain that has turned late October into the winter of discontent, for the despairing Italians in retreat and for the hero separated from his love by a war that has become meaningless. (Only a dozen pages before, p. 191, had come the well-known rejection of his earlier idealism: "I had seen nothing sacred, and the things that were glorious had no glory and the sacrifices were like the stockyards at Chicago if nothing was done with the meat except to bury it.") In contrast to this, the last image before his eyes as he drops off to sleep suggests two different kinds of love: the sexual desire of men stranded in the loneliness of war (Barto's comic threat of seducing the two little girls), and the love of God ("Real virgins. Probably very religious"). Even the former is difficult of fulfillment during a disastrous military retreat, so that the soldier's twofold obsession—to sleep, and to sleep with a woman—is reduced for the moment to the

<sup>3</sup> *The Oxford Book of English Verse* (Oxford, 1925), p. 53, marked "16th C.?" (Italics mine.)

former ("If there were no war we would all probably be in bed"). And in such a time and place the latter, sacred love, is simply unthinkable, unless one's thoughts revert to childhood's prayer in the sanctity of the home, which is exactly what they do in the next sentence: "In bed I lay me down my head." By the inverted word order of what would otherwise seem like a gratuitously incongruous element in this dream, unobtrusively but surely he invokes the familiar

Now I lay me down to sleep,  
I pray the Lord my soul to keep;  
If I should die before I wake,  
I pray the Lord my soul to take.

"If I should die" is certainly applicable to a soldier surrounded on all sides by death; in terms of the whole novel it applies to Catherine too, looking forward to his reiterated cry "What if she should die?" as she lay actually dying in childbirth at the end (331). But in the context of the dream itself it recalls the little girls praying God to keep them pure.

This surprise reappearance of the young virgins Barto had made a proposal to, "using the vulgar word," leads to more elaborate word-play: "Bed and board. Stiff as a board in bed." The first of these, in spite of its triteness, has a double significance; it is the minimum that a husband is required by custom to provide for his family, and negatively it is the legal term defining the first stage of divorce (*a mensa et thoro*, "from bed and board")—which exactly describes Henry's present involuntary separation from Catherine. The second phrase is a prurient pun; the board, by an ingenious scrambling of the first phrase, becomes stiffened into a phallic symbol of his longing for her. Readers conditioned by Freud have probably never failed to catch this, but too much taken with Hemingway's sexual frankness they may have been thrown off the trail of what follows. For it is when the hero's thoughts turn to his true love ("Catherine was in bed now") that his dream opens out into its full significance, which goes far beyond mere eroticism.

The crescendo begins with "Blow, blow, ye western wind," ushering in the complaint of the lover in winter, though the phrases from the old lyric are fragmentary and garbled at first. "Well, it blew and it wasn't the small rain but the big rain down that rained. It rained all night." When he was last with Catherine it had been raining too, but only a gentle rain that lent an air of privacy to their rendezvous, and though at night also a very different kind of night from the



present disastrous one. In view of the whole novel's weather symbolism these were ominous symptoms, it is true, for a similar light rain will be falling on the spring night at Lausanne when Catherine dies (335-343). Indeed, there are only two memorable scenes in the book when it is *not* raining, and these are the two most vividly associated with a life of peace and love: first, near the beginning, the chaplain-priest's account of his home in the bright cool air of the Abruzzi mountains, where "a man may love God" without feeling foolish and where "the spring . . . was the most beautiful in Italy" (74-76); second, near the conclusion, at the chalet in the Swiss Alps where Catherine and Henry have their only real life together, their love soaring into an idyll in the clear winter sunshine for a few months before it goes down to its tragic end (299-327). But midway in the novel there is still a great distinction in his mind between the "big rain" symbolizing the general destruction of war and the "small rain" that merely plagued their love without dampening it. For the soldier in Italy as well as the poet in England, both winter-bound, it is the western wind that will bring the light spring rains and the end of separation. Caught in the deluge brought by the north wind (*tramonto*), Lieutenant Henry quite naturally invokes through the old lyric the western wind that will bring the renewal of life and love, unaware of the tragic irony that for the doomed lovers it will be only a "false Spring" (321).

In his present war-dream he can only look back to the Milan episode, when in spite of the small rain it was not "winter" for them in either inner or outer climate, as a dream of love to be repeated. So his yearning (perhaps his foreboding too) wrings a cry of anguish from him: "Christ, that my love were in my arms and I in my bed again." This certainly strikes the note of physical passion, as it rightly should, since *A Farewell to Arms* is one of the great love stories of the century. But there are other meanings not too far submerged beneath the surface of the dream language. Even the exclamation "Christ," when uttered by sensitive souls under high emotional tension, hovers halfway between prayer and profanity. "Time's wingèd chariot," quoted earlier and echoed later, is what gives urgency to this soldier's plea for one more night with his beloved. And when the love of man for woman reaches the point of demanding expression in poetry, this in itself is a token of aspiration above the flesh. For all his worldly pose he has been concerned for some time with this dual aspect of his affair.

Early in the book, in that same conversation with the priest mentioned above, they were discussing sacred and profane love. Lieutenant Henry's mind was preoccupied with his changing attitude toward Catherine, which had begun on the level of sexual desire, differing only in behavioral pattern from that which the other soldiers satisfied through prostitutes. That kind of thing is only passion and lust, the priest said, remembering the ribald talk at mess. It is utterly different from the love of God: "When you love you wish to do things for. You wish to sacrifice for. You wish to serve." When Henry asked, "If I really loved some woman would it be like that?" (75), the celibate would not venture an answer. But the development of his love for Catherine in the ensuing months has been clearly in this direction and its progress is actually recorded in the dream, from the symbol of carnal desire at the beginning to his solicitude for her and the child at the end. Even in the lyric he quoted there are overtones of a spiritual sort. The old poet surely knew of the traditional medieval symbol of Christ as the gentle rain, falling on the earth in spring to make it green and fertile again. So there is in these lines at least a suggestion of heavenly love cast in earthly terms, though the poem is secular in mode. And if Hemingway were not aware of this, how else explain the cryptic line, "That my sweet love Catherine down might rain"? As a man who confesses he does not know how to love God, she is the one he worships, her grace what he implores. Only her love raining down on him can make the earth green again with spring, and the downward flow of her delivery in childbirth will bring the renewal of life in the fruitfulness of love.

With the free association of ideas expected in dreams, this sequence is followed out by the next sentence, "Blow her again to me," since it suggests the whole context of a cradlesong in *The Princess*, from which it is lifted:

Sweet and low, sweet and low,  
 Wind of the Western sea,  
 Low, low, breathe and blow,  
 Wind of the western sea!  
 Over the rolling waters go,  
 Come from the dying moon, and blow,  
 Blow him again to me;  
 While my little one, while my pretty one, sleeps. . . .

For those who think of Hemingway as exclusively a spokesman for the hardboiled this must come as a shock, a lullaby from Tennyson! But there it is inescapably in the text, and it actually measures the

final motion of the dream, from the most basic sexual desire to the highest sentiments of home and married love. By changing one pronoun he makes the quotation his own, shifting the scene from a mother waiting for the return of a sailor-father to his "babe in the nest," and fitting it to the exigencies of a novel where the soldier yearning for his beloved simply prays that the same western wind will turn winter into spring and "Blow *her* again to me." In terms of Tennyson's lullaby the reunion will take place "Under the silver moon"; in terms of the novel it will come after the torrential rains of the dark night of war are over ("In a little while it will be morning"). Meanwhile they can merely wait and dream. Catherine and Henry's child, still in the womb and not yet part of their life, is referred to only indirectly ("I'm sorry he makes you so uncomfortable"), but his coming accounts at least in part for the new tenderness of the lover, now directed solely to the pregnant mother. "Try and go to sleep, sweet," he ends his lullaby. The reader, from memory, can fill in all the rest—from "Sweet and low" to "sleep, my pretty one, sleep."

The protective device of the dream, which insulates him from the need to be hard, is enhanced by the fact that though he was talking out loud in his sleep it was in English, incomprehensible to his Italian companions. On waking, Lieutenant Henry is plunged back into the deluge of war, engulfed in death and disaster, profanity and obscenity and all the rest. So the lyrical interlude, cut off as abruptly as it began, stands in sharp contrast to the tough style which immediately takes over again, beginning with a four letter expletive from his driver: "—," Piani said. "They've started again" (205). This continues, with increasing disintegration of all values, to the end of the retreat two chapters later. But the dream is not lost, merely locked in the hero's heart, and its major affirmations reappear twice in muted form. Once, while escaping from the enemy, as his men fall away from him one by one crying "Peace" and "Home," Henry asks the remaining loyal one why he did not run with the others. "'I should think a married man would want to get back to his wife,' I said. 'I would be glad to talk about wives'" (229). Again, while escaping from his own battle police, who would have shot him if he had not broken from them and dived into the river. Now lying on the floor of a freight car, temporarily safe but half-dazed, he falls into a kind of daydream: "I could remember Catherine but I knew I would get crazy if I thought about her . . . so I would not think about

her, only about her a little, . . . lying with Catherine on the floor of the car. Hard as the floor of the car . . . and lonesome inside and alone with wet clothing and hard floor for a wife" (240). Home and married love! Throughout, such words have come to represent all that men dream of as not-war, just as war is the desolate world of not-home, where love can only take its chances. And these same words, strangely enough, have been more often on his lips than on hers—the sentiment of the hardened soldier even more than of the expectant mother. After the loss of his idealism for a cause, they become the measure of all his conduct to the end of the book. But the alert reader of the dream passage already knows the high place these terms hold on Lieutenant Henry's index of values. Flesh or spirit? Flesh and spirit.

It would be imprudent to draw sweeping conclusions from the interpretation of a single passage in one novel, but it might be provocative of further close readings to suggest them. When Hemingway dispensed with the lyrical mode altogether, it may be ventured, he could be guilty of abject parody of his own athletic style, as in *Across the River and Into the Trees*. When he allowed it to become too dominant the result could be spongy, as in the Hispanic rhetoric and soft ideology of *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. Most recently, it could be suggested of *The Old man and the Sea*, he achieved a real measure of success by going all the way into romantic fable, and this may indeed be the beginning of a new direction yet to be coped with. But the Hemingway still mostly admired and argued over is the author of the early fictions—*The Sun Also Rises*, *A Farewell to Arms*, and half-a-dozen of the best short stories. If their impudent manner and their surface nihilism had been all they had to offer, they would have dropped from the lists long ago. Perhaps their staying power derives not from their tough exterior alone but also from their tender spots of sensibility carefully nurtured in a dehumanized world—those passages of muted lyricism that provide both a measure and a meaning for the protective toughness. Rare and brief as they are, they achieve a special reasonance by being sounded against the hard polished surface of his typical prose. It was by laying one style against the other that Hemingway became a modern writer for our century, rather than merely the spokesman for a lost generation.

The Johns Hopkins University

CHARLES R. ANDERSON

## The Titles of "MSS AB"

The importance of the agreement of the titles of MSS Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 402, of the *Ancrene Riwe* (MS A) and Bodley 34 of the "Katherine Group" (MS B) has been largely overlooked. This agreement offers an example of what might be called "unique incidence"—an unusual concord, not necessarily linguistic, that sets a group of MSS apart. Other studies of MSS AB have used the evidence of such concord, including J. R. R. Tolkien's "*Ancrene Wisse* and *Hali Meidhad*,"<sup>1</sup> which concentrated in part on the distinctive development of the OE second class of weak verbs in these MSS, and the articles by James R. Hulbert<sup>2</sup> and A. J. Bliss<sup>3</sup> on the spelling conventions shared by them.

But although it has long been noted that the titles in these MSS are alike in form, this agreement does not seem to have been considered of any importance. The agreement itself is obvious:

### MS A:

I þe feaderes & i þe sunes & i þe hali gastes nome her biginneð  
ancrene wisse. (f. 1r)

### MS B:

[I]þes feaderes ant [i þe]s Sunes. & iþe almih[ti g]astes nome.

[Her biginne]ð þe Martyrdom of sancte K[aterine]. (f. 1r)<sup>4</sup>

Iþe feaderes & iþes sunes & iþes hali gastes nome her biginneð

þe liflade & te passiun of seinte margarete. (f. 18r)

Iþe feaderes & iþe sunes & iþe hali gastes nome. Her biginneð

þe liflade. ant te passiun of seinte Iulienne. (f. 36v)

Epistel of meiden had meidene froure (f. 52r)<sup>5</sup>

her bigineð: sawles warde (f. 72r)<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Essays and Studies*, xiv (1929).

<sup>2</sup> "A Thirteenth-Century English Literary Standard," *JEGP* (Sept. 1946), 411-414.

<sup>3</sup> "A Note on 'Language AB,'" *English and Germanic Studies*, v (1952-53), 1-6.

<sup>4</sup> So read by S.R.T.O. d'Ardenne and J.R.R. Tolkien, "MS. Bodley 34: A Re-collation of a Collation," *SN*, xx (1947-48), 71.

<sup>5</sup> R. Furuskog, "A Collation of the *Katherine Group* (MS Bodley 34)," *SN* xix (1946-47), 148 has the following: "On the last line (line 25) of f. 52r is the title *Epistel of meiden had meidene froure* . . . St J ends with f. 52r line 23, and on line 24 we might expect to find the formula used, with slight variations, in the titles of all the other texts in B . . . and of *Ancrene Wisse*. . . . On this line, however, appear the first two lines of the sixteenth-century verses printed in St J, ed. d'Ardenne, p. 70 n. 5., and the photostat shows no other writing on this line." I would say that the title "*Epistel of meiden had meidene froure*" is not in the hand of the other rubrics.

<sup>6</sup> Furuskog, p. 160, notes that Wanley read the title: "I þe feaderes. ant i þe sonas. ant i þe hali gastes nome. her bigineð Sawles ward." Traces of this complete title can still be made out on the bottom of f. 71v, ll. 24-25. In

The original titles, then—at least so far as they can be restored—were identical except for the use of “almih[ti g]astes” rather than “hali gastes” in the title to St. Katherine. This agreement was mentioned, for one, by Joseph Hall in 1920, in his *Selections from Early Middle English*, in his description of MS A: “. . . then 117 folios, on the first of which is a marginal rubric, J þe feaderes & i þe sunes / & i þe hali gastes nome / her beginneð ancrene / wisse, as at the beginning of SJ . . . and SM in MS Bodley 34.” (II, 354).<sup>7</sup>

But much more important than this agreement between these MSS is the fact that none of the other MSS of the *Ancrene Riwe* or of the “Katherine Group” provide anything like this formula for a title. Indeed, none of the five other English MSS of the *Ancrene Riwe* that are roughly contemporary have any title at all, but occasional titles are found in the two other MSS of the “Katherine Group” (e.g. “Her cumseð þe uie of seinte iuliane. ant telleð of liflade”—MS Royal 17A XXVII, 56r).

Moreover, it might seem that so obvious a formula as the one used in MSS AB would be found in numerous other ME MSS. This is not so. In all the MSS printed by the EETS, o. s., only one closely approximates it: “In þe name of þe fadre and of the sone and of þe Holy Gost, her ben þe ten comaundements of oure lord.”<sup>8</sup> Even here the word order is somewhat different, and *ben* is used, not *biginneð*.

This formula for the title may not be unique, but it is at least not common. It cannot be held that such evidence as this by itself supports the theory of a common origin, or “school,” behind these two MSS. However, the agreement of their titles must be considered more than a coincidence; it offers more proof of the surprisingly close relationship of MSS AB, even to the most minor details.

University of Akron

WILLIAM J. STEVENS

addition there seems to have been a title at the top of f. 72r, now cut off by the binder. Furuskog finds enough left to read with some certainty: Iþe feaderes & iþe . . . s & (?) iþe hali g . . . . . g. The title “her bigineð: sawles warde” is found somewhat lower down on f. 72r and is quite clear.

<sup>7</sup> The title of MS A is not, however written in the margin, but shares the first four lines of the text (the initial *R* extends down five lines):

REcti diligunt te. I þe feaderes & i þe sunes  
IN canticis. spon & i þe hali gastes nome  
sa ad sponсорum. herbiginneð ancrene  
Est rectum grammaticum. Rectum wisse.

<sup>8</sup> *Vices and Virtues*, ed. W. Nelson Francis, EETS, o. s., 217. This MS is some 200 years later than MSS AB.



## Stendhal, Shakespeare and a Fool's Fall

In Stendhal's unfinished novel, *Lucien Leuwen*, Mme de Sauve-d'Hocquincourt asks the corpulent M. de Sanréal to name the person from whom he had received the report that the slender and good-looking Lucien had fallen from his horse.

Rien que du docteur Du Poirier, répondit Sanréal, fort piqué de la plaisanterie sur l'épaisseur de sa taille; rien que du docteur Du Poirier, qui se trouvait chez Mme de Chasteller précisément à l'instant où ce héros de votre imagination a pris par terre la mesure d'un sot.<sup>1</sup>

This derisive description of a person's fall is striking and Stendhal borrowed it, we believe, from Shakespeare. In *Cymbeline* (I. ii), one of Stendhal's favorite plays,<sup>2</sup> Cloten, referring to his encounter with Posthumus, in which "they were parted by gentlemen at hand," says to the two Lords who accompany him: "I would they had not come between us." The Second Lord replies [*aside*]: "So would I, till you had measured how long a fool you were upon the ground."<sup>3</sup>

This is not the only instance of Shakespeare's use of this periphrasis. In *King Lear* (I. iv), another play with which Stendhal was quite familiar,<sup>4</sup> Kent trips Oswald and then says to him: "Away, away! If you will measure your lubber's length again, tarry."<sup>5</sup>

Although the falls mentioned in Shakespeare are not from a horse, it seems quite probable that Stendhal, who knew "le divin Shakespeare" [*sic*] practically by heart, was struck by the aptness and originality of Shakespeare's figure of speech and welcomed the opportunity to use it.

The University of Georgia

JULES C. ALCIATORE

## Renan et la Légèreté Française

La légèreté, ce trait tour à tour séduisant et fâcheux qui est sans doute l'une des caractéristiques de l'esprit français, semble avoir préoccupé Renan tout au long de sa carrière. Si l'on songe au phi-

<sup>1</sup> *Lucien Leuwen*, 2nd ed. (Monaco, 1945), I, 45. Italics mine.

<sup>2</sup> See, in this connection, the *Table alphabétique des noms cités dans l'édition de ses oeuvres*, ed. H. Martineau (Paris, 1937), II, 156, for Stendhal's numerous references to this play.

<sup>3</sup> Italics mine.

<sup>4</sup> *Table alphabétique*, IV, 111.

<sup>5</sup> Italics mine.

losophe souriant et sceptique des dernières années, on pourrait s'attendre à ce que Renan ait été un apologiste de cet aspect de la personnalité nationale. Or bien au contraire, l'austère érudit qu'il fut longtemps n'y vit en général qu'une regrettable faiblesse. Certes, Renan sait apprécier la légèreté lorsqu'elle naît de la vivacité d'esprit, de la délicatesse du goût, d'une ironie supérieure. Mais il s'irrite de ce qu'elle ne soit souvent chez ses compatriotes qu'un parti pris de superficialité, une garantie contre le ridicule, parfois même un penchant pour le vulgaire.

L'historien qu'est Renan impute ce travers aux éléments gallo-romains qui contribuèrent à la formation du caractère national. Selon lui ce serait même le triomphe de ces éléments sur les apports germaniques qui, vers la fin du moyen âge, aurait marqué l'esprit français d'une empreinte définitive: c'est à ce moment que la France s'éloigna des sources pures de l'esprit chevaleresque pour s'enfoncer dans la frivolité et le matérialisme bourgeois. Renan considère la *Farce de Maître Patelin* comme une des premières manifestations littéraires de "cet esprit goguenard, destructeur de toute noblesse et de tout idéal." Il y découvre "l'expression de cette laideur vulgaire et immorale, mais spirituelle, qui caractérise le XV<sup>e</sup> siècle" (éd. H. Psichari, II, 212) -et qui, malheureusement, allait demeurer l'une des constantes de l'esprit français.

Non pas que le Français se montre désormais incapable du sérieux et de l'idéalisme que Renan admire dans le haut moyen âge. Mais il prend l'habitude de tout dire et de tout faire avec au moins un semblant de légèreté. C'est en ce sens que Montaigne -qui est par ailleurs souvent proche de Renan lui paraît critiquable: par sa complaisance envers soi-même mêlée d'un brin de fanfaronnade, par sa peur du ridicule, par son attitude ironique envers tout ce qui rappelle le pédantisme, l'auteur des *Essais* est typiquement français:

Nous sommes si timides contre le ridicule que tout ce qui semble y prêter nous devient suspect, et que bien des esprits délicats aiment mieux rester superficiels que de s'exposer à une accusation [de pédantisme]. . . . Montaigne a soin de nous avertir "qu'il ne s'est rongé les ongles à l'étude d'aucune science, qu'il n'en a gousté que la crouste première en son enfance, et n'en a retenu en général qu'un informe visage, un peu de chaque chose et rien du tout, à la française." (II, 217)

Renan n'est évidemment pas dupe de la prétendue ignorance de Montaigne, mais il s'irrite de cette pose que les Français affectent volontiers et dont ils se vantent comme d'une supériorité.

Renan ne craint pas d'évoquer à propos de l'attitude de Montaigne

celle du Mascarille des *Précieuses Ridicules* qui déclarait fièrement que ses vers ont l'air cavalier et ne sentent pas le pédant. Sans doute était-ce de Mascarille et non du pédantisme que Molière se moquait là. Mais l'on sait que par la suite, il ne devait pas se faire scrupule de ridiculiser les pédants. Aussi Renan, malgré toute son admiration pour Molière, reprochera-t-il à ce dernier de tomber tout comme son Mascarille dans "ce que Mme de Staël appelait si bien le *pédantisme de la légèreté*" (l'expression plaît à Renan puisqu'il la reprend plusieurs fois).<sup>1</sup> De même que les personnes pieuses ont pu se sentir visées à travers le personnage de Tartuffe, Renan, savant et homme de science, ne saurait rester indifférent à la satire de Molière. Car tourner en dérision les prétentions intellectuelles des Femmes Savantes, n'est-ce pas dans une certaine mesure insulter au goût des connaissances, aux travaux de l'esprit, à la noble érudition? Renan se défend bien de "déprécier la comédie en général, et surtout ce sentiment délicat, l'un des plus élevés et des plus complets de notre nature, l'ironie" (II, 214). Mais il ne se console pas de voir érudition et pédantisme trop souvent confondus en France et se désole qu'on y fasse rire aux dépens de ce qui devrait être sacré. "Cette façon de présenter les meilleures choses par leur côté ridicule, remarque-t-il, . . . a toujours de graves inconvénients dans un pays comme le nôtre, où le ton est la règle à peu près souveraine de l'opinion" (II, 225).

Renan croit donc pouvoir découvrir en France dès le XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle une véritable tradition de légèreté, tradition qui se trouva consolidée en 1685 lors de la révocation de l'Edit de Nantes. Car il lui apparaît que la politique religieuse de Louis XIV, forçant à l'exil tant d'esprits éminents, modifia profondément la mentalité nationale. La Réforme avait fait éclore au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle un admirable mouvement intellectuel grâce auquel la France s'était trouvée à l'avant-garde dans le domaine des sciences historiques et philosophiques. Malheureusement le départ des Protestants, au siècle suivant, brisa ce magnifique élan tout en favorisant le règne d'une société légère plus entichée de belles lettres que de philosophie.

L'esprit littéraire étant seul encouragé, il en résulta une certaine frivolité. La Hollande et l'Allemagne, en partie grâce à nos exilés, eurent presque le monopole des études savantes. Il fut décidé dès lors que la France serait avant tout une nation de gens d'esprit, une nation écrivant bien, causant à merveille, mais inférieure pour la connaissance des choses, et exposée à toutes

<sup>1</sup> Comme Renan le rappelle dans une note de *l'Avenir de la Science*, Malebranche avait déjà qualifié Montaigne de "pédant à la cavalière." (III, 1131)

les étourderies que l'on n'évite qu'avec l'étendue de l'instruction et la maturité du jugement. (I, 75-76)

Après 1685 la prédominance en France d'une société brillante distribuant ses faveurs aux gens d'esprit et envisageant "la frivolité comme de bon ton et le sérieux comme ridicule" (II, 218) fut désormais incontestée. L'on conçoit que Renan n'ait jamais pardonné à Louis XIV d'avoir poussé la nation sur la pente de la superficialité et de l'avoir mutilée de ce qu'il considérait comme le meilleur d'elle-même.

Si Renan avait entrepris une étude approfondie et systématique de la légèreté française, on ne peut douter qu'il y eût fait une large place au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Une époque où l'on se souciait de la bienséance plus que de la morale, où l'on prisait les bons mots plutôt que les bonnes mœurs, où l'on discutait les choses les plus graves sur un ton de badinerie, n'aurait pas manqué d'attirer les foudres du censeur. Or dans les brèves remarques qu'il formule ça et là au sujet du Siècle des Lumières, Renan ne s'en prend pas tant à la frivolité de l'époque qu'à la superficialité de ses philosophes, auxquels il reproche d'avoir créé un joug nouveau, celui "d'une sorte de bon sens étroit, réduisant le monde de l'esprit à quelque chose d'étriqué, de mesquin, de froidement raisonnable" (II, 1072). Tandis que la pensée française au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle pêche par absence d'esprit véritablement philosophique, le Français une fois encore ne sait être que brillant et léger. Et Renan d'observer à propos du plus célèbre des Philosophes, Voltaire, qu'il "ne comprenait ni la Bible, ni Homère, ni l'art grec, ni les religions antiques, ni le christianisme, ni le moyen âge" (I, 77). Toutefois si cet esprit ironique et peu profond, raisonnable et irreligieux est bien fait pour heurter la sensibilité de Renan, il n'en trouve pas moins grâce à ses yeux pour avoir été en France et en Europe l'un des plus actifs promoteurs de "la tolérance, la justice, le bon sens public" (*ibid.*).

Renan s'efforce généralement de peser ses jugements. Cependant il est un cas dans lequel il ne donne voix qu'à sa colère et à son dégoût: c'est dans l'article qu'il consacra à Béranger en 1859. Son indignation vient évidemment du fait que ce poète populaire incarne pour lui ce que la légèreté française peut avoir de plus vil. Que la France ait donné naissance à un tel écrivain, il n'y a pas lieu de s'en émouvoir; mais lorsque ce chansonnier à l'âme vulgaire est proclamé "patriarche de la France nouvelle," Renan se sent "autorisé à réfléchir sur cette

curieuse adoption et à rechercher par quel côté du génie français elle a pu s'accomplir" (I, 309-310).

Scandalisé qu'un pays si catholique ait pu s'accommoder du célèbre "Dieu des bonnes gens" de Béranger, qu'il se soit complu à voir galvauder ses valeurs les plus sacrées, Renan en conclut que la France affectionne l'impiété grivoise. Un ton léger semble tout justifier auprès des Français, et cela explique qu'un Béranger, avec sa gaieté vulgaire, son irrévérence et ses blasphèmes, ait pu devenir le *poète national*. Renan touche ici à ce qu'il considère comme le côté le plus odieux de la personnalité nationale - et cela l'entraîne à l'un des jugements les plus cruels qu'il ait formulés à ce sujet: "Le vice égrillard, la coquetterie de l'immoralité, la gentillesse du mal, voilà le péché français par excellence, voilà la petitesse, voilà le ridicule dont le Français croit se laver par son air dégagé et son éternel sourire" (I, 312).

Dans cet essai sur Béranger, la légèreté française est, on le voit, dénoncée avec beaucoup plus de force et d'amertume qu'à l'ordinaire. Or c'est à la lumière de l'expérience personnelle de Renan qu'il convient d'expliquer ce réquisitoire. Sans doute l'historien du Christianisme s'était-il lui-même isolé de ses compatriotes en rejetant la foi établie (et les événements de 1862, lorsque sa chaire du Collège de France lui sera retirée, ne pourront que confirmer ses idées sur les Français). Renan déplore que le sérieux, la recherche de la vérité, l'esprit scientifique, le respect des choses religieuses ne rencontrent pas auprès des Français un accueil aussi favorable que la légèreté, les gauloiseries ou même l'anticléricalisme. C'est en ce sens qu'il oppose le succès de "la théologie de Béranger" (tel est le titre de son essai) à l'échec que le protestantisme subit jadis en France. Il est clair que Renan s'identifie aux Protestants quand il écrit:

Ah! si les pasteurs du désert avaient voulu imiter le curé que devait chanter M. Béranger, ils n'eussent pas été des séditeux. Mais ils étaient graves, indépendants et austères; ils furent pendus ou roués. . . . On est compromis dans ce pays si l'on y avoue des sentiments particuliers en religion. . . . Que le penseur réclame les droits imprescriptibles de la science et du libre examen, c'est un novateur, et, s'il a des lecteurs, un homme dangereux. (I, 318)

Il ne faudrait pas conclure ici que l'animosité de Renan à l'égard de la légèreté française soit généralement suscitée par un réflexe d'amour propre blessé. Ce qui explique son attitude critique, c'est avant tout son caractère et sa sensibilité. Héritier de cette race celtique "vivant tout en dedans," enfant d'un pays dont il dit que "la joie même y est un peu triste," Renan était par nature enclin au sérieux et à l'idéa-

lisme. De plus sa formation religieuse et intellectuelle ne put guère qu'accentuer ses prédispositions. Si Renan eut une pensée directrice tout au long de sa vie, ce fut d'atteindre à force de recueillement et de travail à la plus grande perfection intellectuelle et morale possible; et s'il eut une ambition, ce fut de faire partager à ses lecteurs et à son public son ardeur à rechercher la vérité. Ainsi l'on conçoit que tout ce qui dans l'esprit français trahit le seul désir de briller ou de se montrer spirituel, tout ce qui implique la primauté du ton sur le fond, du plaisir vulgaire sur l'idéal, insulte à ses valeurs les plus chères.

Dès lors comment s'étonner que Renan se soit parfois senti étranger à sa propre culture et dépaycé parmi ses compatriotes? Quoi de plus naturel aussi qu'il ait été entraîné dans le mouvement de germanophilie qui marqua profondément les intellectuels français de l'époque? Il est logique que le philosophe, que l'homme de science se soit tourné vers le pays qui symbolisait alors l'amour des plus hautes connaissances et qui semblait plus que tout autre voué au culte de l'idéal. C'est, rappelons-le, dès l'*Avenir de la Science* que découvrant chez les penseurs et les savants allemands l'esprit scientifique qui allait guider le monde futur, Renan érigea en exemple le génie germanique et ses nobles conquêtes. Dans sa philosophie de l'histoire, dans ses travaux de philologie comme dans ses essais, il s'attachera toujours à suivre les traces des penseurs d'Outre-Rhin.

Ce culte que pendant si longtemps Renan voua à l'Allemagne devait inévitablement l'amener à faire des comparaisons désobligeantes pour son propre pays. D'ailleurs lorsqu'il se plaît à opposer à la légèreté française le sérieux et la gravité des Allemands, Renan reprend un lieu commun du XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle, véritable poncif issu des théories de Mme de Staël sur les peuples du Nord et les peuples du Midi.<sup>2</sup> Le fait qu'il lui arrive aussi de contraster la pureté d'âme et l'idéalisme de sa Bretagne natale à l'immoralité et à la frivolité de la France, confirme l'extériorité de son point de vue.

Gardons-nous cependant de voir dans ces critiques une manifestation de haine contre la France. Car ce serait trahir celui qui s'exclamait un jour: "Pauvre patrie! C'est parce que nous l'aimons que

<sup>2</sup> Selon un analyste du germanisme français, depuis la fin du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle, "le diptyque France: légèreté et corruption; Allemagne: sérieux et vertu, est établi, fixé dans les esprits, et il n'en sortira plus." (Louis Reynaud, *Français et Allemands. Histoire de leurs relations intellectuelles et sentimentales*, Paris, 1930, p. 248.) Cf. Jean-Marie Carré, *Les Ecrivains français et le mirage allemand, 1800-1940* (Paris, 1947), introduction et 1ère partie.



nous sommes quelquefois un peu durs pour elle" (II, 1086). En fait on peut dire que, contrairement à nombre de ses contemporains affligés de cette maladie qu'Edgar Quinet appela *teutomanie*, Renan eut généralement soin de nuancer ses jugements. Mais dans une France qui lui paraissait s'enfoncer dans le matérialisme et le positivisme, il était porté de par sa nature et sa vocation à s'ériger en censeur: prédicateur laïque, il ne se lasse jamais de sermonner les Français, ne désespérant pas de les amener à se réformer. De là le ton implacable que prennent souvent ses anathèmes.

Les cruelles épreuves que la France traversa en 1870-1871 vinrent malheureusement confirmer ses avertissements. Et Renan qui avait toujours prôné une alliance des génies français et allemand dut assister impuissant à cette guerre absurde entre les deux peuples. Il écrivit alors certaines de ses pages les plus germanisantes et les plus impitoyables à l'égard de la France: tandis que les Prussiens s'étaient préparés à l'épreuve avec une rigueur scientifique typiquement allemande, les Français s'étaient jetés dans la lutte avec une inconscience inimaginable. Pourtant à l'heure où l'existence même de la France vient à être menacée, Renan ne peut sans scrupules déprécier sa patrie en danger et faire l'apologie de l'ennemi. Aux prophètes de la nouvelle *Kultur* qui proclament la décadence et la mort de la France, il répond en faisant l'éloge des "qualités de leurs défauts" qu'il discerne chez ses compatriotes. C'est ainsi qu'au moment où, dans sa *Réforme intellectuelle et morale de la France*, il propose des "remèdes" qui s'inspirent souvent de l'exemple de la Prusse, il s'engage dans une brûlante controverse avec David Strauss, l'éminent érudit allemand qu'il n'a pas cessé de considérer comme son maître. A ce dernier qui souhaite l'annihilation de la France pour le bien de l'humanité, Renan écrit: "C'est au nom des vrais intérêts éternels de l'idéal que je serais désolé que la France n'existât plus. La France est nécessaire comme protestation contre le pédantisme, le dogmatisme, le rigorisme étroit." Et Renan d'ajouter: "Cette légèreté qu'on nous reproche est au fond sérieuse et honnête" (I, 443).

Est-ce là simple boutade? Ces mots ne s'expliquent-ils que par le contexte où ils se placent (année 1870, lettre adressée à un Allemand qui dénigre la France)? Y a-t-il ici contradiction avec le Renan d'avant guerre? Pas vraiment. Car il faut le souligner, Renan a toujours été conscient de la complexité de l'esprit français. Et s'il s'est attaché pendant longtemps à enrayer les manifestations les moins désirables de la légèreté française, c'est toujours en l'acceptant comme

partie intégrante de la personnalité nationale. Ainsi il écrivait déjà en 1864:

Certes il serait fort puéril d'espérer que la France modifiera son caractère; il serait même téméraire de le souhaiter. Elle est charmante comme elle est. Aurait-on la baguette des fées, il faudrait trembler avant de toucher à des choses complexes où tout se tient, où les qualités sortent des défauts, et où l'on ne peut rien changer sans faire crouler l'ensemble. (I, 95)

Dans les années qui suivent la guerre franco-prussienne, il arrivera à Renan de reprendre le traditionnel diptyque France-Allemagne. Mais c'est pour l'utiliser désormais dans un sens bien différent. Ainsi en 1879, quand il déclare dans son "Discours de Réception à l'Académie Française":

Je crains fort que des races, bien sérieuses sans doute, puisqu'elles nous reprochent notre légèreté, n'éprouvent quelque mécompte dans l'espérance qu'elles ont de gagner la faveur du monde par de tout autres procédés que ceux qui ont réussi jusqu'ici. Une science pédantesque en sa solitude, une littérature sans gaieté, une politique maussade, une haute société sans éclat, une noblesse sans esprit, des gentils hommes sans politesse, de grands capitaines sans mots sonores ne détrôneront pas, je crois, de sitôt, le souvenir de cette vieille société française si brillante, si polie, si jalouse de plaire. Quand une nation, par ce qu'elle appelle son sérieux et son application, aura produit ce que nous avons fait avec notre frivolité, des écrivains supérieurs à Pascal et à Voltaire, de meilleures têtes scientifiques que d'Alembert et Lavoisier, une noblesse mieux élevée que la nôtre au XVII<sup>e</sup> et au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle, des femmes plus charmantes que celles qui ont souri à notre philosophie, un élan plus extraordinaire que celui de notre Révolution, plus de facilité à embrasser les nobles chimères, plus de courage, plus de savoir-vivre, plus de bonne humeur pour affronter la mort, une société, en un mot, plus sympathique et plus spirituelle que celle de nos pères, alors nous serons vaincus. Nous ne le sommes pas encore. Nous n'avons pas perdu l'audience du monde.<sup>2</sup>

Existe-t-il plus belle et plus émouvante apologie de la France?

Cependant dans les années 80, tandis que s'apaisent l'émoi et les passions suscitées par la guerre, Renan vieillit et sa personnalité se

<sup>2</sup> On rencontre chez Amiel, contemporain de Renan et trait d'union lui aussi entre l'esprit français et l'esprit germanique, ces lignes écrites en 1868 après la lecture d'un ennuyeux ouvrage philosophique allemand: "L'érudition et même la pensée ne sont pas tout. Un peu d'esprit, de trait, de vivacité, d'imagination, de grâce, ne gâteraient rien. . . . L'affreux mot: 'Mangeurs de saucisse, idéalistes' (Taine) vous revient comme une vengeance. O la clarté, la netteté, la brièveté! Diderot, Voltaire et même Galliani! Un petit article de Sainte-Beuve, de Schérer, de Renan, de Victor Cherbuliez fait plus jouir, rêver et réfléchir que mille de ces pages allemandes bourrées jusqu'à la marge et où l'on voit le travail moins son résultat. Les Allemands entassent les fagots du bûcher, les Français apportent des étincelles. . . ." (*Fragments d'un Journal intime*, 9 avril 1868. Ed. Bouvier, Paris, 1931, I, 240.)

transforme. C'est alors que l'on verra le vieux maître tomber lui-même dans ce travers de légèreté qui l'avait jadis si fort irrité: il s'exprime par boutades, il ironise à tout propos, il semble préférer le sourire au sérieux. Et l'on croit rêver lorsqu'il suggère à des étudiants que "la vieille gaieté gauloise est peut-être la plus profonde des philosophies" (I, 867-868).<sup>4</sup>

Comment faut-il interpréter ce revirement? Faut-il y voir le relâchement d'une énergie longtemps soutenue par un idéalisme intransigeant? S'agit-il d'une sorte de capitulation intellectuelle et morale résultant de la conscience d'avoir perdu une bataille? Ou bien est-ce plutôt l'aboutissement logique des démarches d'un esprit toujours tendu vers l'objectivité absolue, toujours conscient de la relativité des choses? Peut-être est-ce tout cela à la fois.

On ne peut nier en tout cas qu'il y a loin de l'attitude de Renan vieillissant à celle qui avait longtemps caractérisé l'austère censeur de la légèreté française. Mais s'il est tentant de souligner les contradictions qui existent entre ces deux attitudes, peut-être même entre ces deux Renan, n'oublions pas qu'un esprit aussi nuancé que Renan s'efforça généralement d'envisager toute question sous ses multiples facettes et que ce n'est que rarement qu'il lui arriva de s'abandonner à une critique passionnée. Aussi semble-t-il bien que si l'on fait la synthèse des jugements -critiques et éloges- qu'à différentes époques Renan porta sur la légèreté française, on possède un document révélateur sur la personnalité renanienne aussi bien qu'une des meilleures évaluations de l'esprit d'un pays dont Montesquieu écrivit un jour: "Laissez-lui faire les choses frivoles sérieusement et gaie-ment les choses sérieuses."<sup>5</sup>

Bryn Mawr College

MICHEL GUGGENHEIM

<sup>4</sup> Il est intéressant de noter que dans son essai sur la *Farce de Patelin*, écrit en 1856, tandis qu'il critiquait dans l'esprit français cette forme d'ironie qui ne sait que railler et rabaisser, Renan avait soin de signaler aussi tout ce que l'ironie peut renfermer de finesse. "L'homme, observait-il, n'a pas de marque plus décisive de sa noblesse qu'un certain sourire fin, silencieux, impliquant au fond la plus haute philosophie." (II, 215) Ces lignes ne sont pas sans éclairer l'attitude renanienne des dernières années.

<sup>5</sup> *De l'Esprit des Lois*, Livre XIX, ch. 5.

## Notes on the Etymology of *Serendipity* and Some Related Philological Observations

The word *serendipity* has now become fashionable in a number of different fields of study.<sup>1</sup> Professor Robert K. Merton has referred to the "diverse social circles of litterateurs, physical and social scientists, engineers, lexicographers and historians" in which the word has diffused, and he has commented upon some of the recent uses (since 1945) of this "contrived, odd-sounding and useful word."<sup>2</sup> At a recent meeting of the Royal Statistical Society in London, some differences of opinion were expressed concerning the meaning of the word, which led the present author to contribute some brief etymological comments to that discussion.<sup>3</sup> In view of the general interest in the word, and the importance of the concept which it denotes, we shall now present a more thorough discussion of the etymology of *serendipity* and of some related philological matters.

*OED* states that *serendipity* is "a word coined by Horace Walpole who says (Let. to Mann, 28 Jan. 1754) that he had formed it upon the title of the fairy-tale '*The Three Princes of Serendip*.' . . ." Since a number of people have expressed the conviction that Walpole had written *The Three Princes of Serendip*, the following two facts may be of interest: (i) A version of this rather lengthy tale was published in London in 1722,<sup>4</sup> and (ii) while it is true that Walpole was in London (or in its environs) in 1722, he was at that time approximately five years old.<sup>5</sup>

*OED*, quoting Walpole's letter to Sir Horace Mann, states that the

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., Leslie Hotson, "Literary Serendipity," *ELH*, ix (1942), 79-94; Walter Bradford Cannon, "Gains from Serendipity," *The Way of an Investigator* (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1945); Robert King Merton, "Sociological Theory," *Amer. Jour. of Sociology*, L (1945), 469n; Anon., "Serendipity: the Happy Accident," *Jour. Amer. Medical Assoc.*, CLV (July, 1955), 26-27; Robert King Merton, "The Serendipity Pattern," *Social Theory and Social Structure* (Rev. ed., Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1957); W. Allen Wallis and Harry V. Roberts, *Statistics: A New Approach* (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1956), pp. 9, 19, 31, 501; Leo A. Goodman, "Discussion on Mr. Beale's Paper," *Jour. Royal Statistical Soc., Series B*, xxii (1960), 83-84.

<sup>2</sup> Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure*, pp. 103-104.

<sup>3</sup> Goodman, loc. cit.

<sup>4</sup> *The Travels and Adventures of Three Princes of Serendip: Intermixed with Eight Delightful and Entertaining Novels: Translated from the Persian into French and from thence done into English* (London, 1722).

<sup>5</sup> Walpole was born on 5 October 1717. The widespread erroneous conviction that he was the author of the fairy-tale may be due, in part, to a misinterpretation of either the *OED* statement quoted above or of similar statements in other dictionaries; e.g., the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* states that *serendipity* was "coined by Horace Walpole after *The Three Princes of Serendip* . . ."

heroes of the fairy-tale (i. e. the three princes) "were always making discoveries, by accidents and sagacity, of things they were not in quest of." This dictionary defines *serendipity* as 'the faculty of making happy and unexpected discoveries by accident,' and it mentions that E. Solly, in his *Index Titles of Honour*, published in 1880, refers to Walpole's coinage of this word and he says it is 'looking for one thing and finding another.'

The quotation, appearing in *OED*, from Walpole's letter seems to me to be somewhat incomplete. Since a fuller quotation might shed more light on Walpole's definition of *serendipity*, we shall therefore include this here. ". . . *Serendipity*, a very expressive word, which as I have nothing better to tell you, I shall endeavor to explain to you: you will understand it better by the derivation than by the definition. I once read a silly fairy tale, called 'The Three Princes of Serendip': as their Highnesses travelled, they were always making discoveries, by accidents and sagacity, of things which they were not in quest of: for instance, one of them discovered that a mule blind of the right eye had travelled the same road lately because the grass was eaten only on the left side, where it was worse than on the right—now do you understand *Serendipity*? One of the most remarkable instances of this *accidental sagacity*, (for you must observe that no discovery of a thing you are looking for comes under this description,) was of my Lord Shaftsbury, who, happening to dine at Lord Chancellor Clarendon's, found out the marriage of the Duke of York and Mrs. Hyde, by the respect with which her mother treated her at the table. . . ." (Walpole's reference to the "mule blind of the right eye" is not quite correct; in the edition of the fairy-tale published in 1722, it was a "camel . . . blind of an eye.")

*Serendip* (*Sarendip* or *Serendib*) is a former name for Ceylon. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* suggests that this name is "a corruption of the Sanskrit *Sinhaladvipa*." Although it is true that *Sinhaladvipa* is a Sanskrit name for Ceylon, we have come to the conclusion that *Serendip* is not a corruption of *Sinhaladvipa*. This conclusion is based upon the following observations: (i) The Sanskrit *sinha* means 'lion' (*dvipa* means 'isle'), so that *Sinhaladvipa* probably referred to the 'island of lions' (perhaps so called as once abounding in lions) and/or to the fact that, according to the chronicles, the father of the founder of the Sinhalese dynasty there was named *Sinhabāhu* ('lion-

\* *The Letters of Horace Walpole, Earl of Orford: Vol. III, 1753-59* London, 1940), p. 23.

<sup>7</sup> *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, s. v. 'Ceylon.'



armed') and he sprang from the union between a lion (*lion* may refer to a man who belonged to a tribe having a lion totem, to a man who was lion-like, a hero or eminent person, a prince or king, etc.) and a daughter of a king of Bengal; (ii) the Sanskrit *suvarna-dvīpa* and the Hindustani *sunahrā-dīp* mean 'golden-isle' (the Persian *zarīn* means 'golden'), so that the original form of *Serendip*, which is related to *Sarandīp*, a Hindustani name for Ceylon, probably referred to the 'golden-isle' and/or to the fact that, according to the chronicles, a city of gold was built there.<sup>8</sup> Thus, *Serendip* is probably a "corruption" of a word referring to the 'golden-isle.'

Martha Pike Conant has referred to the fact that the English version of *The Three Princes of Serendip*, supposedly translated from Persian into French and thence into English, actually came from a French version by De Mailli in 1719, which was in turn from the Italian of Christoforo Armeno in 1557.<sup>9</sup> Conant suggests that many of the stories in these three versions are apparently based on Italian *novelle* and are unoriental. She states that the English version stands by itself in being perhaps the only pseudo-translation which came by way of eighteenth-century France from sixteenth-century Italy. (In view of the fact that this fairy-tale is considered to be a "pseudo-translation," it may be worthwhile to note here that the particular adventure of the three princes, which is referred to by Walpole, and some of the other adventures as well, are actually very similar to certain oriental tales; we might also add here the fact that a legend, related in the name of Rabbi Yochanan, which is included in the *Talmud*, tells of how two Jewish slaves discovered that a camel blind of one eye . . . had travelled the same road lately. . . .<sup>10</sup>

Conant remarks that "the events of the story, in De Mailli's render-

<sup>8</sup> Sir Monier Monier-Williams, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (Oxford, 1899), pp. 507, 1213, 1236; George S. A. Ranking, *An English-Hindustani Dictionary* (London, 1905), pp. 73, 190, 269; Arthur N. Wollaston, *An English-Persian Dictionary* (London, 1904), p. 131; *Chambers's Encyclopaedia*, s.v. 'Ceylon.'

<sup>9</sup> Martha Pike Conant, *The Oriental Tale in England in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1908). The French version of the fairy-tale is entitled *Le Voyage et les Aventures [sic] des Trois princes de Sarendip traduit du persan* (Paris, 1719); the Italian is *Peregrinaggio di tre giovani figliuoli del Re di Serendippo: Per opera di M. Christoforo Armeno dalla Persiana nell'Italiana lingua trapportato* (Venetia, 1557).

<sup>10</sup> See, e.g. Paul Isaac Hershon, *A Talmudic Miscellany* (London, 1880), p. 35; Israel Lévi, "Contes Juifs," *Revue des Etudes Juives*, XI (1885), 209-234. Had Walpole known of the Talmudic tale he might have coined a word such as, e.g. *carmelity*, rather than *serendipity*, in honor of the two Jewish slaves referred to in the *Talmud*, who happened to have been taken as prisoners of war on Mount Carmel, and whose experiences were strikingly similar to the particular adventure of the three princes described by Walpole in his letter to Mann.



ing, are said to have occurred 'in the happy time when kings were philosophers and sent each other important problems to solve' . . . the frame-tale recounts the travels of three 'equally beautiful and gifted' princes, who seek culture and win success in various enterprises." She also mentions that "their first adventure [i.e. the adventure referred to by Walpole] is the one probably imitated by Voltaire in *Zadig*." This comment suggests that she may have tended to accept as true Fréron's accusation, written in 1767, charging that Voltaire had plagiarized, in his *Zadig*, parts of the De Mailli rendering of *The Three Princes of Serendip*.<sup>11</sup> With regard to the possible plagiarism by Voltaire of De Mailli, experts have by now dismissed this charge.<sup>12</sup>

The adventure of the three princes of Serendip, as described in the English version or in the De Mailli rendering and as referred to in Walpole's letter of 1754, the corresponding events in Voltaire's novel and in the Talmudic tale, the instance of Lord Shaftsbury's "accidental sagacity" described in Walpole's letter, all would suggest a meaning for Walpole's *serendipity* somewhat different from what now appears to be its present usage.<sup>13</sup> E. Solly's definition in 1880, "looking for one thing and finding another,"<sup>14</sup> is also somewhat different from present usage. At present *serendipity* usually means "the knack of spotting and exploiting good things encountered accidentally while searching for something else,"<sup>15</sup> exemplified by "research directed toward the test of one hypothesis [yielding] a fortuitous b-product, an unexpected observation which bears upon theories not in question when the research was begun."<sup>16</sup>

University of Chicago

LEO A. GOODMAN

<sup>11</sup> Raynal Fréron, "Plagiat de M. de Voltaire; Autre Plagiat," *Année Littéraire* (Paris, 1767), I, 145.

<sup>12</sup> George Ascoli said that "c'est peu probable" and then explained his position in the commentary published in Voltaire, *Zadig ou la Destinée, Histoire Orientale* (Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1929). See also Victor Chauvin, *Bibliographie des Ouvrages Arabes ou Relatifs aux Arabes* (Liège and Leipzig, 1903), VII, 158-161.

<sup>13</sup> Some of the questions being explored in a monographic study, by E. G. Barber and R. K. Merton, of the sociological semantics involved in the cultural diffusion of the word *serendipity*, are described in Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure*, p. 104, n. 4a; the "changes of meaning [*serendipity*]" has undergone in the course of diffusion" will be examined in this study.

<sup>14</sup> *OED*, s. v. 'serendipity.'

<sup>15</sup> Wallis and Roberts, op. cit., p. 9.

<sup>16</sup> Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure*, p. 104. After this article was in the printer's hands, the author received a mimeographed copy of the first three chapters of the monographic study by R. K. Merton and E. G. Barber, *Serendipity: A Study in Historical Semantics and the Sociology of Science* (1958). For a thorough and interesting study of this subject, the reader is referred to this monograph.

## REVIEWS

William J. Paff, *The Geographical and Ethnic Names in the Þiðriks Saga: A Study in Germanic Heroic Legend* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1959. vii + 238 pp. Harvard Germanic Studies 2). THIS fine commentary on the Place and Tribal names in *þiðriks saga* is, as the author claims, a study in Germanic Heroic Legend not unlike the glossary of heroes and thibes and lands in Malone's well known edition of *Widsith* (1936) which Mr. Paff lists and uses. At first sight it seems odd that the author should limit himself to the geographical and the ethnic names since what he is really after is the study of Germanic heroes and the legends forming around them. And I must say, that I think this study of his would have been improved for most readers, if he had included in it a list of the personal names not only as they appear in the saga but also as they appear in his own studies on the place names, which of course are the mainstay of the book and swarm with heroes and heroic legend. To give an example: *Appollonius of Tira* is listed in two places in the index of the saga (first edition 1853); in the present book one finds him thoroughly discussed under *Tira* only. But this is really quibbling about composition and should not detract from the value of the book. But as far as I can check—and that does not include works in the slavonic languages—the author is a fine and reliable scholar who really seems to have advanced our knowledge about the intricate problems of this difficult saga.

One of the main theses of the book, expressed in the foreword and in the article on *Húnaland* is, that this name represents the Saxon duchy as it was during the thirteenth century, when the Hanseatic merchants of its well-to-do cities, Bremen, Münster, Dortmund, and Soest swarmed not only over Bergen where they told these interesting stories, but also as far afield as Smolenzk in Russia and, at the same time, having been at war for decades and decades against the Wilzen or Vilcians (of *Vilcina saga* in *þiðreks saga*) on their Eastern border. If Soest, though important, was not quite the capital of Saxony it was the presumed capital of *Húnaland* and the stronghold of Attila where he and his wife Grimhildr receive her brothers the Niflungar that she manages to get killed to avenge her husband Sigurðr Sveinn on her brothers. In the Eddic poems (*Atlakviða*) Guðrún does not kill her brothers to avenge Sigurð, but Atli kills them for their

[Niflunga]hord and then Guðrún to avenge them kills her own sons, serving them in a cannibalistic way to Atli (like Völundr and Medea). There is no doubt about it that the Saxon Hansa merchants thought that the Niflungs were killed at Soest and had even place names marking the event. But why would the storytellers change the familiar Saxony into *Húnaland*? Paff thinks it has to do with the political history of the Saxon Duchy. During the twelfth century Saxony was ruled by an enterprising count Henry, who got into political scraps not only with the Archbishop of Cologne, but also the Emperor. But he lost out after 1180 and during the thirteenth century the influence of his family was much reduced—to the benefit of the merchants apparently. Thus Paff thinks that it would have appeared both expedient and desirable to avoid the Saxon name reminiscent of the old strong duchy. Hence the selection of the fictitious name of *Húnaland* which did not offend anyone and was, besides, well suited to the name Attila. I do not know German history enough to be sure of this, but it seems plausible. Indeed I have found very few cases in the book which do not seem to be correct or at least plausible. An exception is his discussion of the name Samson which one finds under the place name *Salerni* (page 161) which in turn occurs in the first chapter of *Þiðriks saga*. Says Paff, "Samson is probably related to *samr* 'black';" but *samr* means "the same." It is *Sámr*, that means "dark" or "murky" and then we would have to read *Sáms-son*. But if our murky giant was the son of a *Sámr*, a familiar name in O. Icel., what was then his real given name? A patronymic could not be so used in the good old Germanic times any more than in Modern Icelandic. This throws us inevitably back to the Biblical Samson, but would not Delila's Samson be dark and murky? In his discussion of *Þiðriks* or *Þiðreks saga* in the foreward the author falls into the same error as in *samr* / *sámr*. For though spelled with an accent in the manuscript some times, they are always pronounced *þiðriks* or *þiðreks* in Modern Icelandic and therefore most likely also in the *þiðriks saga*, though the Germans have *Diet-*. In this connection I would suggest that the author get a Fulbright Fellowship and go to Iceland. His comment on *Trentudalir* show that he is not quite familiar with the Icelandic scene. Printers errors are in *Scane*, page 164 (2) \**anjos* read *aujos*, and in *Sio-land*, page 165 *Lerje* read *Lejre*. This is of course nothing to speak of in a long and difficult text.

The bibliography seems fairly inclusive, it may be very good.

Nevertheless I missed some papers by Kemp Malone, like the one on "Áki Örlungatrausti," *Saga-Book of the Vik. Soc.* 1934, xi, 26 ff. which should have been mentioned under *Tarlungaland*. By the way, the Scandinavians must have kept their tongue in their cheeks if the Germans ever spoke about *Kerlingaland*.

The Johns Hopkins University

STEFAN EINARSSON

Christopher Tolkien, ed., *The Saga of King Heiðrek the Wise* (Edinburgh: Nelson, 1960. xxxviii + 100 pp. *Nelson's Icelandic Texts*). IN 1956 this saga with a slightly different name, *Hervarar saga ok Heiðreks*, and using the normalized text of Guðni Jónsson's *Íslendingasagnauktgáfan*, was published by G. Turville-Petre in the Viking Society series of texts, but with an Introduction on the legends and the manuscripts by Christopher Tolkien, who was praised by Turville-Petre for his knowledge of these matters. Now Christopher Tolkien, who must be the son of John R. R. Tolkien, professor at Oxford and famous *Beowulf* scholar, has himself become lecturer in Old English, New College, Oxford, presumably to succeed his father. He has now also edited, translated, and annotated this saga for the *Nelson's Icelandic Texts*. This seems thus to be his maiden scientific work and it is a pleasure to say that it is both solid and workmanlike, if not, indeed, brilliant. In the Introduction he divides his matter into two chapters, one dealing with the legends, the other with the manuscripts. The chapter on the legends he starts with a definition of the *fornaldar sagas*, the genre to which *Heiðreks saga* belongs. Then he enumerates the main motifs of the saga; the cursed sword (*Tyrfingr*), the *Sámsey* poetry, two poems: "The Waking of Angantýr," and "The Death Song of Hjalmar," then the good counsels violated, the "Riddles of Gestumblindi," the battle of the Goths and the Huns (based on the extremely old poem, *Hlöðskviða*), and, finally, the conclusion of the book, which is a short chronicle of Sweden's pre-history, not unlike Snorri's *Ynglinga saga*. So much about the legends in the preface. In his treatment of the three main manuscripts of the saga, R, H, and U, the editor follows Prof. Jón Helgason in the main, but normalizes his texts. His translations both of poetry and prose, seem to be excellent, very readable, and, as far as I did check, correct. His imitation of the alliterative verse form (the *Beowulf* line) strikes me as being excellent. Fortunately for him the saga contains no skaldic poetry, which would be a hard nut to

crack, but some of the riddle verses are not too easy to translate either. I have found no errors, but a few misprints: page 45 *till* read *tíl*, 3rd line from the bottom; page 67 *Alfhidi* read *Alfhildi*, line 11 from bottom; page 68 *veðiar* read *veiðar*, line 6 from top; page 80 in stanza on the middle of the page, *koningr* read *konungr*; page 94 in *fylgja* of the glossary *ættaryfylgjur* read *ættarfylgjur*.

The editor prints some excellent notes in appendices and in a glossary of technical terms. Here I miss a note on *heitstrenging* with a reference to my article in *PMLA* 1934, XLIX, 975 ff., and a note on *sonargöltr* with a reference to Hugo Pipping's paper in *Acta Soc. Scient. Fenn.* 1927, V, 7 ff. or to E. Sievers' papers in *PBB* XII, 177 and XVI, 540 ff. He would have found these references in Alexander Jóhannesson's *Isländisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (1956). In a footnote on horseflesh-eating, page 63, the author expresses the opinion that the Germanic people in heathen times probably only ate horseflesh at sacrifices. I wonder why. I see no reason why horses and cattle should not be equally attractive for feasting and food in famine as long as no tabu was attached to either food-animal. That came with a vengeance to the horse in Christianity and to the cow in Hindu India.

Two articles obviously came too late for Mr. Tolkien's use. Einar Ól-Sveinsson wrote a note on *basmir* in *Skírnir* 1958, CXXXII, 248 ff., and Birger Nerman on "Hlöðskviðas álder" (The Age of *Hlöðskviða*) in *Folkloristica, Festskrift till Dag Strömbäck* 13. Augusti 1960, page 255 ff. According to Einar Ól. Sveinsson *basmir*, which also occurs in Russian, is a Turkish word meaning "costly printed cloth" whether cotton or silk. E. Ó. S. thinks that the word might have been borrowed directly at the contact of the Goths and the Huns or after the time of Attila and Ermanric (fifth century) or at the time when the Væringjar came in contact with Turkish tribes (eighth century). Nerman produces archæological parallels to *hjalmi hringreifðum* (ring-adorned helm), *skjallanda skarfs ór gulli* (ringing gold pieces), and *hornbogar Gota* (the hornbows of the Goths). He dates the archæological remains to the middle of the sixth century, thinking that the poem would be datable to the same period, but philologists like Professor Jón Helgason are reluctant to admit that. But, in general, this is Nerman's attitude to the dating of the Eddic poetry.

Looking at Mr. Tolkien's rather full bibliography one is struck by the absence of any edition of *Widsith*, notably the two great by



Chambers and Malone. Mr. Tolkien does quote Chambers' *Widsith* on 46 but neither Malone's *Widsith* nor his *Studies in Heroic Legend and Current Speech* (1959), though several of these articles touch *Heiðreks saga* as a glance at the index will show.

The Johns Hopkins University

STEFAN EINARSSON

Ronald Paulson, *Theme and Structure in Swift's Tale of a Tub* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1960. xiv + 259 pp. \$4.50). MR. Paulson's argument is intricate, and this makes an attempt at summary both necessary and difficult. He interprets Swift's *Tale* as attacking a modern form of Gnosticism, a heresy which taught that the "elect" achieve salvation through a grain or seed of divinity implanted in the body. This Gnostic doctrine has two implications: the ability of the divinely inspired individual to interpret reality for himself, and a radical dualism of body and spirit. The first implication develops into the *Tale's* general theme, the conflict of illusion and reality. The modern "elect"—Peter, Jack, and Swift's *persona*—try to impose their private meanings on words and objects, and then, as delusion leads to aggression, upon others and upon the reader. Recurrent sexual imagery suggests the physical drives motivating such spiritual and intellectual pretensions. The dualistic view of the body as a mere container is reflected in the imagery of tubs and vessels and in the clothes philosophy. The resultant willingness to abuse the body for "spiritual" ends produces the Aeolist rituals and the recurring images of deformed bodies, dominated by excrescences or lower organs which express the impulses of "spirit." The form of the *Tale* itself resembles such a body, parodying the seventeenth-century "anatomies," loose compilations of obscure knowledge in which argument is overwhelmed by digression, and symmetry is distorted to express the author's idiosyncrasies. But the *Tale* only seems disorderly. The normal meanings of words and objects persist despite the *persona's* reinterpretations: reality defeats illusion. Like a true modern, the *persona* writes only for the moment, but his fragmentary images and contradictory assertions form patterns or imply norms which he does not intend. Thus allusions to diseased and disordered bodies suggest the harmonious order of state and church, the "body politic" and the "body of Christ," communities in which private delusion may be checked by common understanding and the wisdom of tradition.

This interpretation seeks to combine ancient and modern, old



scholarship and new criticism. The theory underlying this increasingly popular eclectic method may deserve scrutiny. In the present instance, Mr. Paulson's reading of the text is more impressive than his account of the literary background. Chronology and historical generalizations are sometimes loose: Rabelais and Montaigne are discussed under "Characteristics of Seventeenth-Century Form," and Mr. Paulson considers madness to be "associated with the Jacobean period rather than with the eminently sane Restoration and Augustan periods" (p. 27, n. 3). Crucial terms ("raillery," "anatomy") seem poorly defined and freely applied. Quotations from Swift do not always exactly fit Mr. Paulson's point: the passage quoted on pp. 23-24, for example, relates only to the modern stress on sound (deriving probably from Casaubon's chapter on "Rhetoricall Enthusiasme"), while the quotations on the next two pages pertain to diction rather than to style. Nor do other authors always fare better. A mistranslation of Irenaeus (p. 114; cf. p. 236) makes Acamoth the creator of matter. The distinction between the visible and invisible church is not the point at issue between Hooker and the Calvinists (p. 152; cf. Hooker's *Laws*, III.1). The account of Temple's *Essay* (pp. 89-91) seems illogical in itself and inaccurate as a summary of Temple. Much of this background material is concentrated in the first two chapters. I find little here that illuminates the *Tale* and much that seems irrelevant or unconvincing, such as the involved discussion of Eachard and Marvell—their differences from Swift, as Mr. Paulson admits (p. 65), are as striking as the likenesses.

Mr. Paulson's last two chapters are increasingly devoted to a critical analysis which is both ingenious and provocative. One need not always agree with his reading of the text (does Swift's "stage itinerant" represent stage plays as well as Grub Street productions?). But when the virtuosity Mr. Paulson displays in discussing scientific uses of ordinary language is applied to the *Tale*, the results are often exciting, sometimes brilliant—the passages on "revolutions" and on horse and rider imagery, for instance. Mr. Paulson sees how Swift's physical imagery relates to the Pauline symbolism of the church as the body of Christ (can the church then be "man-made" [p. 232], a human organization rather than a supernatural structure?). He extends this symbol through the related images of the church as house and family to the contrasted modern versions, the tub and the crowd. The same ability to organize and control a wide-ranging metaphor is evident in the treatment of modernism as Gnostic heresy.

Even critics who may not agree with Mr. Paulson's arguments will find them stimulating and suggestive. One familiar issue is worth raising again since it is central to his case. Mr. Paulson seems to find *personae* wherever he turns. The device is "typically seventeenth-century" (p. 32), and even Montaigne has a *persona*. The author of Swift's "Apology" is as much part of the fiction as the author of the *Tale*. And since the *Tale* demonstrates the efforts of its author, "the Hack," to distort or evade reality, "the Hack is himself the story" (p. 75). This stress on Swift's *persona* militates against the unity of theme Mr. Paulson skillfully traces between the *Tale*, *The Mechanical Operation of the Spirit*, and *The Battle of the Books*, and he finds it awkward work to relate the three fictional speakers. Moreover, the Hack's views sometimes seem to coincide with Swift's, and therefore Mr. Paulson concludes that the Hack lacks the independence of a convincing fiction. But perhaps this is to criticize Swift for what he did not try to do. Swift himself speaks of the irony which runs through the whole book. It may be that he regarded the *persona* as one among the many devices of this unifying and pervasive irony, a device to be employed with precisely the inconsistent opportunism which Mr. Paulson finds characteristic of seventeenth-century style. The consciousness Swift evokes in the *Tale* is the consciousness of an age: it seems too great in range and diversity for any single person or *persona*.

Princeton University

SHERMAN HAWKINS

Martin C. Battestin, *The Moral Basis of Fielding's Art: A Study of Joseph Andrews* (Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan Univ. Press, 1959. xii + 195 pp. \$4.50). THE influence of the latitudinarians upon Fielding's ethical thought in general and upon *Joseph Andrews* in particular is investigated in this study. In reaction against the tendency to associate much of Fielding's thought with Shaftesbury, Battestin elaborates upon the suggestions of James A. Work and Charles B. Woods that the novelist agreed more closely and avowedly with the benevolist writings of a small group of Low Church divines: Isaac Barrow, John Tillotson, Samuel Clarke, and Benjamin Hoadly. All were frequently praised by Fielding; all shared a belief in the essential goodness of human nature and militantly championed the doctrine of salvation through good works. Battestin traces these ideas through Fielding's writings and points out the emphasis upon bene-

volence and good works in *Joseph Andrews*, especially in the character of Parson Adams.

Battestin considers *Joseph Andrews* to be a moral allegory. After examining the theme of the Christian hero and the Christian pilgrimage in the latitudinarians as well as in popular contemporary Augustan literature, he concludes that the journey in *Joseph Andrews* is a religious pilgrimage reshaped geographically by the classical trope of town and country. Joseph and Adams travel away from the evils of London toward the relative simplicity and naturalness of the country. Joseph marries Fanny and lives in the semi-paradise of Mr. Wilson's home, a proper end to a successful pilgrimage. There is an interesting vindication of the "Wilson digression," which is interpreted as a rake's progress with a happy ending: Wilson learns the lesson of *vanitas vanitatis* in London and retires to the country. The digression is also seen as a parable of providence and fortune. Wilson is led to prison and despair by evil fortune, but he is saved by Harriet Hearty just as Boethius was by Lady Philosophy. When Wilson learns the nature of providence, he is able to marry Harriet and retire to his earthly paradise. Standing in the center of *Joseph Andrews*, the Wilson digression thus becomes an epitome of the Christian pilgrimage and a foreshadowing of the novel's conclusion.

Battestin also examines the ethical symbolism inherent in the biblical prototypes of Fielding's two protagonists. Here again, he relies upon glosses provided by the latitudinarians. Andrews, who plays Joseph to the Potiphar's wife of Lady Booby, Battestin considers representative of chastity, which he interprets broadly as temperance, the rational control of the passions. Adams, identified with Abraham by his patriarchal character and the incident of the supposed drowning of his son, is considered a representative of faith perfected in good works (from James ii.20-24), summed up as "charity." Fielding's two protagonists thus encompass man's duty to himself (to avoid temptation) and man's duty to others (to practice charity). Finally, Battestin considers Adams to be a spiritual tutor, who helps Joseph flee from London to the country, to marriage and to moral maturity.

The last chapter of Battestin's book is an appendix on Fielding's attitude towards the clergy. It discusses a number of contemporary texts attacking the clergy, as well as Fielding's writing on the subject, especially the *Champion* articles. It concludes that Adams is a near-perfect parson.

Two aspects of this book seem particularly open to question.

Studies of determinism in Fielding suggest that Battestin is perhaps overly sanguine in assuming the novelist's total agreement with the latitudinarian belief that benevolence, absolutely necessary to moral goodness, is "present in all [men] to some degree." A much more important objection, however, concerns Battestin's treatment of the symbolic significance of biblical types. Since his point, that Fielding exploits the biblical type as an important vehicle of meaning, has been too long neglected, it is regrettable that Battestin does not move outside the limited context of latitudinarian sermons. For example, he never mentions that Joseph, as well as Abraham, journeyed through strange lands and thus became a type of the Christian pilgrim. Nor does he note such detailed correspondences between Joseph and his biblical predecessor as Andrews' "party-colored brethren," the loss of his livery at the hands of Booby, or the resemblance of the seduction scenes with Booby to those described in Josephus. When Battestin begins his moral glosses, he relies heavily upon a single sermon by Isaac Barrow, "Of Being Imitators of Christ," which he suggests as the "direct source" for Fielding's adoption of Joseph and Abraham as twin examples of the good man. It is true that Barrow's work begins, as Fielding's novel does, by recommending the moral efficacy of good examples, two such examples being Abraham and Joseph, but it also deals at length with Moses and St. Paul and briefly mentions many other, less important, examples of good men. Barrow's sermon does not imply that Joseph and Abraham represent complementary virtues, and it uses Abraham as an example of pure faith, according to the glosses of St. Paul, rather than as an example of faith perfected in good works. Battestin's view of the two protagonists of *Joseph Andrews* as complementary biblical types is continually troublesome; it ignores, for example, the fact that Joseph was a traditional type for the good governor distinguished by prudence, a type who thus impinges upon what Battestin sees to be Adams' particular office—man's duty to others.

The greatest weakness in Battestin's handling of biblical types is, however, his determination to view both protagonists of *Joseph Andrews* as unequivocal moral imitations. Because both must therefore be considered good men, any weakness in their characters is dismissed as a "foible" used merely for the sake of a pleasing and sympathetic realism. Parson Adams' miserable failure of faith when he hears of his son's death thus becomes no more than a simple and mildly amusing identification of Adams and Abraham. Although the

chapter on ethics notes Fielding's demand that benevolence should be prudently directed towards its proper ends, Battestin never remarks the Parson's obvious lack of any sort of competence. Yet Adams' good nature is too often like that of Mrs. Wisdom in *The Letter Writers*: it would save or destroy without distinction. Finally, although he notes Dick Taylor's article on "Joseph as Hero in *Joseph Andrews*," Battestin does not note its implications: while Joseph is in complete agreement with the Parson at the beginning of novel, he is involved in a series of arguments with Adams which grow progressively more heated, until the two characters stand quite apart at the end. Battestin's assumption of a constantly prescriptive goodness in both Joseph and Adams obscures one of the novel's major themes.

Any number of specific objections to Battestin's reading of *Joseph Andrews* do not, however, deny the value of his book. It contains a concise and convenient survey of Fielding's major ethical ideas and convincingly relates them to latitudinarian thought. By examining Fielding's use of biblical symbolism, especially by emphasizing the pilgrimage motif, the book departs from that viscous mainstream of criticism which has been content to praise the novelist as a happy imitator of the multitudinous details of life. Battestin shows that *Joseph Andrews* has a coherent artistic and moral structure, and his work therefore belongs with that of Sherburn on *Amelia*, of Crane on *Tom Jones*, and of Wendt on *Jonathan Wild*. He has provided an excellent introduction to Fielding's first fully developed novel—but it is an introduction marred with misleading conclusions.

Davis, California

JESSIE RHODES CHAMBERS

C. A. Mayer, *La Religion de Marot* (Geneva: Droz, 1960. 186 pp.).

PAR son titre, ce travail de M. Mayer fait penser à d'autres ouvrages: *La Religion de Jean-Jacques Rousseau* (1916); *Le Problème de l'incroyance au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle. La Religion de Rabelais* (1947); *La Religion de Voltaire* (1956); mais M. Mayer fait, avec raison, remarquer que Marot n'était pas un théologien. Si Rousseau et Voltaire ont été profondément préoccupés par les questions religieuses, si Rabelais a eu une éducation qui le préparait à la vie monastique, s'il a vécu, pendant plusieurs années, dans des cloîtres, et s'il fut homme d'église, Clément Marot, lui, se distingue de tous ces écrivains par son instruction qui ne fut pas poussée très loin, comme le relève aussi,

d'ailleurs, M. Mayer. Marot fut, en outre, essentiellement un poète de cour. Il est vrai que Plattard a été "frappé du nombre et de l'étendue des poèmes religieux qui prennent place dans les derniers recueils de vers publiés par Marot ou dans les publications posthumes" (*Marot* [Paris, 1938], p. 196); mais C.-A. Mayer déclare: "En dehors de ses traductions, Marot a écrit très peu de poèmes vraiment religieux." Il semblait, en tout cas, que, plutôt que la religion de Marot, ce seraient les oeuvres religieuses de celui-ci qui méritassent d'être étudiées. Et elles l'ont été, dernièrement, par Mlle Paulette Leblanc (*La poésie religieuse de Clément Marot* [Paris, 1955]). "Pourtant, à cause de ses opinions religieuses, Clément Marot fut emprisonné," dit M. Mayer, qui rappelle que notre poète alla deux fois en exil et qu'il mourut en pays étranger. Dès son introduction, C.-A. Mayer justifie ainsi son travail; mais une objection se présente immédiatement à l'esprit: si Marot se défend d'avoir fait gras les jours défendus, si les documents indiquent qu'il était accusé d'avoir commis plusieurs délits et crimes et qu'il était même inculpé d'hérésie, est-ce seulement d'avoir des opinions religieuses condamnées par l'Eglise Catholique qu'il est soupçonné? Toute la question est là. On sait assez que les luttes religieuses du seizième siècle sont, directement ou non, une forme des luttes sociales auxquelles se livraient les hommes de ce temps. Il m'a paru important d'insister sur la formation, vers la fin du quinzième siècle et le début du seizième, d'une *culture* nouvelle qui est la marque de l'ascension sociale de la bourgeoisie, dont elle favorise les intérêts. Il y a, sous le règne de François I<sup>er</sup>, deux clans: celui des Guise et celui de la famille Du Bellay. Marot appartient à ce dernier clan. Il fait partie du groupe dont Rabelais, Etienne Dolet, Bonaventure des Périers, Salmon Macrin, Maurice Scève, Jacques Peletier du Mans étaient quelques-uns des membres les plus célèbres. Budé, Erasme, sont parmi les écrivains et les penseurs auxquels tous ceux que protègent les Du Bellay se rallient. Ils forment le parti de la tolérance et leurs sympathies pour les idées nouvelles se manifestent chaque fois que, sans trop d'imprudence, il est possible de le faire. Marguerite d'Angoulême joindra ses efforts à ceux des Du Bellay pour obtenir un adoucissement au sort des écrivains persécutés. Il est donc bon de mettre en relief les relations qui s'établissent entre les opinions religieuses et les opinions politiques, et de rappeler que l'attitude de François I<sup>er</sup> à l'égard des évangéliques sera influencée par des considérations politiques. On verra ainsi que les mesures que prendront le Parlement et la Sorbonne contre les



nouveaux évangélistes traduisent souvent une attitude d'hostilité non pas seulement à l'égard des opinions religieuses des inculpés, mais aussi, et surtout, à l'égard de la nouvelle culture que ceux-ci représentent. C'est pourtant "la question de la religion de Marot" dont M. Mayer entend s'occuper. Il prétend que l'on a imaginé de voir en Marot un "personnage veule, lâche et flatteur" pour expliquer l'attitude du poète au cours de son existence. Or, affirme M. Mayer, "ce portrait du poète ne repose sur rien."

Disons tout de suite que nous avons peu de renseignements sur la vie de Clément Marot et que presque chaque fois que l'on a voulu découvrir quelle était sa personnalité, on en a été réduit à faire appel à son oeuvre que l'on a interprétée de façons diverses.

M. Mayer est particulièrement violent envers "le plus récent des 'détracteurs' de Marot, le pasteur J. Pannier"; il attaque aussi Imbart de la Tour (voir la préface de l'édition des *Epîtres* donnée par C.-A. Mayer, p. 21) et d'autres commentateurs; il se range, au contraire, du côté de Herriot qui trouve Marot "si plein de coeur et si courageusement hardi" (p. 10, n. 17). Il est assez curieux que, d'une façon générale, M. Mayer critique si vivement les érudits qui l'ont précédé dans l'étude de Marot, ou qu'il ne les mentionne même pas du tout, tandis que seul, ou presque, un conférencier mondain qui fut, avant tout, un homme politique, trouve grâce auprès de lui!

C'est que M. Mayer soutient une thèse qui, d'ailleurs, n'est pas très éloignée de celle que nous avons soutenue: il pense que c'est comme protestant que Marot fut poursuivi, toute sa vie; mais il ajoute que notre poète avait été attiré aussi par "l'humanisme et la Renaissance." Cette rencontre, poursuit M. Mayer, n'était pas fortuite, car "Marot n'était point le seul à n'y voir que trois aspects d'une même réalité." "La poésie religieuse de Marot," continue M. Mayer, "est d'une nature profondément humaine. [...] Comme Rabelais et Bonaventure des Périers, Marot exprime dans sa poésie une conviction humaniste ou humanitaire profonde." M. Mayer cite, comme exemple de l'humanitarisme de Marot, les protestations du poète contre la torture et contre la censure, sa revendication en faveur de la liberté d'examen, son attachement à la paix, sa croyance au progrès, et, pour tout dire, "sa foi dans l'homme."

Ne nous étonnerons-nous pas de ces manières d'équivalence qui voient dans le "protestantisme," l' "humanisme," et la "Renaissance," des aspects d'une même réalité? Que dire encore de cette identification entre l' "humanisme" et l' "humanitarisme"?

P. O. Kristeller a, fort justement, montré que l'humanisme avait pris naissance dans la pensée d'hommes qui s'occupaient, non pas de philosophie ou de science, mais de grammaire et de rhétorique. Les hommes auxquels, au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle, on donnait le nom d'*humanistes*, étaient des professeurs ou des étudiants qui s'occupaient de la langue et de la littérature des Anciens. Mais, aujourd'hui, on a tendance à donner au terme *humanisme* un sens philosophique et religieux qui n'est pas impliqué dans ce qui constitue la littérature des Grecs et des Romains. Veut-on dire, en effet, que la littérature latine et la littérature grecque avaient des qualités *humaines*? Ces littératures étaient, en fait, l'expression d'une civilisation païenne, fondée sur l'esclavage. Y avait-il là des témoignages d'un souci *humanitaire*? Que désigne-t-on, en outre, par le terme *Renaissance*? A. Renaudet rappelait que Faguet disait: "L'humanisme n'est pas le Moyen Age; il n'est pas la Réforme; il n'est pas la Renaissance." Renaudet répliquait: "L'histoire s'accommode assez mal de telles distinctions" et il arrivait à parler de l'"humanisme éternel" (*Humanisme et Renaissance* [Genève, 1958], pp. 32-53). Dès lors, que signifient tous ces termes? N'est-il pas plus prudent d'employer des mots dont on donne une définition précise? Le culte que certains écrivains français du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle avaient pour l'antiquité, pour la *littérature* antique, en particulier, avait un caractère esthétique, plutôt que moral ou philosophique, ou religieux. Ce qui marque le XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle, en France, c'est l'importance que prennent les belles-lettres, les beaux-arts,<sup>1</sup> l'homme de lettres, le dilettante, l'artiste, l'esthète; c'est une diminution de l'élément religieux de la culture, et un affaiblissement du caractère moral des actions des hommes. On oublie que le XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle est l'un des plus barbares de l'histoire: le développement du sens artistique, le désir de jouir de la beauté s'accommodent assez facilement de la cruauté, de la grossièreté, et de la violence des mœurs. Le goût que l'on prenait à la littérature antique n'adoucisait pas la pratique de la vie.

Il est curieux qu'aujourd'hui on cherche à remettre en honneur l'étude des classiques et qu'on prétende que la lecture des oeuvres littéraires permettra aux hommes de développer en eux des sentiments d'humanité. Comme les mots *humanisme* et *humanitarisme* ont la même racine, on s'imagine qu'il est facile de passer de la notion qu'exprime le premier à celle qu'exprime le second. Pourquoi ne parle-t-on donc pas de *philanthropie* dont, disait Balzac, *humanitar-*

<sup>1</sup> A. Philip McMahon, *Preface to an American Philosophy of Art* (Chicago, 1945).

isme était le fils aîné (voir M. Françon, "Sur le vocabulaire de Balzac," *le français moderne*, 25 [1957], 42-47)? C'est que par philanthropie, on entend, comme le dit Balzac, un "amour collectif," tandis que l'on sous-entend que *l'humanisme* est individualiste! N'est-ce pas jongler avec les mots pour donner une apparence de respectabilité au vulgaire égoïsme?<sup>2</sup> (Sur la survivance, au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle, de formes médiévales de pensée, voir la savante discussion de H. Hornik, "Three Interpretations of the French Renaissance," *Studies in the Renaissance*, VII [1960], 43-66).

Après ces considérations générales, passons à l'examen des pièces où Marot a exprimé des idées ou des sentiments qui se rapportent à la religion.

Il n'y a guère de poésies de Marot où il se soit plus clairement exprimé, à ce sujet, que dans *l'Enfer*. M. Mayer, pourtant, commente ce poème d'une façon, certes, très savante et très remarquable; mais il arrive à des conclusions qui ne sont pas, toutes, convaincantes. Il croit que c'est Marot lui-même qui a inventé une histoire d'après laquelle ce serait une ancienne maîtresse qui l'aurait dénoncé. Quant au crime "d'avoir rompu le jeûne quadragésimal," M. Mayer croit pouvoir dire: "Ici, le doute n'est guère possible." Je ne m'étendrai pas sur cette question; mais je rappellerai que j'ai donné une interprétation différente de *l'Enfer*, et que je vois, dans cette poésie, une attaque contre l'Eglise Catholique.

En ce qui concerne les autres pièces qu'analyse M. Mayer, dirai-je seulement qu'il ne me semble pas suffisamment tenir compte du fait que Marot était obligé de plaire à ses protecteurs; or, ceux-ci n'étaient pas, tous, catholiques comme le roi; certains, comme Marguerite de Navarre et, surtout, Renée de France, étaient sympathiques à *l'Evangélisme*. Disons, en outre, que si Marot a traduit cinquante psaumes, ce n'était pas seulement pour se plaire à lui-même. Marot suit les courants de pensée de son temps, et s'adapte aux circonstances de façon à en tirer parti. J'en reviens toujours à ce que j'ai dit sur Marot, comme sur Rabelais et même sur Montaigne: ces écrivains sont, avant tout, des hommes de lettres; or, comme on l'a dit, "l'homme de lettres est, à certains égards, un homme d'affaires" (André Fontaine,

<sup>2</sup> Remarquons que rien, dans la culture des Grecs et des Romains n'est favorable à une conception individualiste de l'organisation sociale. Indiquons que les Jésuites se sont fort bien accommodés de l'humanisme (en entendant ce mot au sens strict) et en ont même fait la base de leur enseignement (voir R. Pomeau, *La religion de Voltaire*, p. 37): "L'Institut des Jésuites avait été créé pour accomplir le grand dessein de réconcilier le catholicisme romain avec le monde moderne issu de la Renaissance."

*Verlaine homme de lettres* [Paris, 1937], p. 5). Marot est à la recherche d'un mécène; il s'efforce de plaire et de distraire, et c'est en contant ses infortunes qu'il veut amuser et obtenir grâces et faveurs. Dans *l'Enfer*, Marot est plus préoccupé de donner libre cours à son ressentiment et à sa colère que de "protester" contre la torture. Ce qu'il dit à ce sujet est assez mince et les vers de Villon, par exemple, nous paraissent plus évocateurs et plus vigoureux que ceux de Marot: écoutons Villon, lorsqu'il maudit

737

Tacque Thibaud

Qui tant d'eau froide m'a fait boire,  
Gir en bas lieu, non pas en haut,  
Manger d'angoisse mainte poire,  
Enferré.

Il reste, non pas en ce qui concerne l'*humanisme* de Marot, mais sa *religion*, que le cas de Marot présente des difficultés. Plattard remarquait: "c'est un fait qu'il y a beaucoup d'émotion dans les poèmes religieux de Marot" (*Marot*, p. 202). Cela prouve-t-il que notre poète soit un évangélique? R. Pomeau (p. 253) a dit que la caractérolgie a confirmé ce que nous savions déjà: "la conviction religieuse dépend du caractère." Voltaire était rangé dans la catégorie des "fébriles," des "colériques secs" (Pomeau, pp. 255-257). Les vers de Voltaire nous font souvent penser à ceux de Marot. Les tempéraments de ces deux poètes nous paraissent, en somme, assez semblables. "Sanguins," "primaires," "actifs," Marot et Voltaire le sont; mais, sur la religion, Voltaire avait des opinions très définies et son anticléricalisme était une véritable "passion" (Pomeau, p. 108). Marot nous paraît bien plus superficiel encore que Voltaire qui, d'ailleurs, était un personnage riche et indépendant, et se distinguait ainsi du pauvre hère qu'était Marot. Pour M. Mayer, la religion de Marot aurait été une morale indépendante de la notion de sanction, libérée du dogme, et il semble que M. Mayer définisse ainsi la "religion naturelle," non pas de Marot, mais de Voltaire: religion "réduite à la morale, sans théologie" (Pomeau, p. 438). Voltaire, en fait, avait la prétention de compléter l'oeuvre de la Réforme; mais, de Marot—modeste poète—au patriarche de Ferney, la distance est grande. Ce dernier voulait fonder une "religion irréligieuse," une religion "pure," et, pendant toute sa vie, il a été obsédé par le problème religieux. Que trouvons-nous dans l'oeuvre et dans la vie de Marot? Il eut à souffrir des persécutions, car il appartenait au parti du progrès, et il était l'ennemi des "ténébrions"; il attaqua, dans ses poésies, l'Eglise catholique, il

suit l'exemple des partisans de l'Évangélisme qui affectaient "de mépriser les argumentations scolastiques et de s'adresser directement au cœur, source d'émotions" (Plattard, p. 202); mais ce n'est pas l'humanitarisme qui semble le mieux caractériser son attitude.

Depuis une dizaine d'années, C.-A. Mayer s'est établi comme le "spécialiste" de Marot le plus autorisé; mais, si nous admirons son érudition sûre et le soin avec lequel il prépare une édition critique des œuvres de Marot, nous ne pouvons pas dire que son travail<sup>3</sup> sur la "religion" de Marot emporte la conviction.

Harvard University

MARCEL FRANÇON

**Albert A. Sicroff, *Les Controverses des statuts de "pureté de sang" en Espagne du XV<sup>e</sup> au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, Didier, 1960. 318 pp. Études de Littérature Étrangère et Comparée).**

ONE of the most deep-rooted and influential aspects of Spanish society and culture for over three centuries was the concern with *limpieza de sangre*, the obsession of proving that all of one's ancestors had been "Old Christians," i. e. not converted from Judaism and with no trace of heresy in the lineage. (People of Moorish ancestry also suffered disabilities under the *estatutos*, but the problem centered primarily on converts from Judaism and their descendants.) In his new study, which is Volume 39 in the *Études de Littérature Étrangère et Comparée*, Professor Sicroff takes up the very fundamentals of this problem, the statutes which demanded purity of blood to qualify for entrance into Spanish religious communities and other private and public organizations, and the controversies that raged around those statutes.

The origins of the question dated from 1391. The massive conversions that took place in that year as the result of anti-Jewish pogroms created a large new class of Christians of Jewish ancestry. Once the religious disability had been removed, they rose rapidly in Spanish society. The "Old Christian" nobility did not hesitate to ally themselves through marriage with the *conversos* and the latter's

<sup>3</sup> On a dit que "le Rabelais de M. Abel Lefranc" était "un Rabelais anti-clérical, qui porte sa date: la III<sup>e</sup> République!" (H. Lefebvre, *Rabelais* [Paris, 1955], p. 13). On pourrait prétendre que le Marot de M. Mayer appartient à la même idéologie radicale-socialiste! Nous ne pouvons pas conclure que la question de l'attitude religieuse de Marot ait beaucoup progressé depuis ce que Villey en a dit (*Marot et Rabelais* [Paris, 1923], pp. 140-141, 420-421), et, malgré ce dernier, il reste une énigme: celle qu'avait posée Edmond Scherer en termes excellents (*Études sur la littérature contemporaine* [Paris, 1885], VIII, 1-18).

ability made them desirable administrators in church and government. As the author points out, the very rapidity with which they advanced was probably the greatest factor exacerbating hostility against them. The first *estatuto* of any kind against the "New Christians" was that of Toledo, 1449, which was proclaimed by the heads of the uprising in that city. The anti-Jewish charges contained therein were answered by several writers, particularly Alonso de Cartagena in his *Defensorium Unitatis Christianae*, but such erudite treatises had no efficacy. In the reigns of Juan II and Enrique IV there was no religious nor civil power strong enough to control the movement and violence against the descendants of Jews increased in the second half of the fifteenth century. Although the Franciscans were the first to sound the alarm, the first religious order to actually adopt a statute of purity of blood was that of St. Jerome, which promulgated one in 1486, although it was not given Papal approval before 1495. The paradox is that the Hieronymites had been the most receptive of all orders to the *conversos*. The cancer spread; an increasing number of orders enacted anti-*converso* measures, as did secular groups such as the masons of Toledo, and educational institutions like the Colegio Viejo de San Bartolomé at Salamanca. In 1522 it was decreed that no person of Jewish blood could graduate from the Universities of Salamanca, Valladolid or Toledo. The cathedral chapters started adopting statutes somewhat late. The first was that of Seville in 1515. During the first century of agitation the sovereigns followed a rather indecisive course. The Catholic Monarchs accepted in general the principle of exclusion, but were not prepared to proscribe all "New Christians." Official recognition of the theory of *limpieza de sangre* came under Felipe II and reached its apogee when the cathedral of Toledo, the primate church of Spain, adopted its regulatory measures which were established in 1547, ratified by Pope Paul IV in 1555 and accepted by the King in 1556. However, this was not the end of the matter. On the contrary, the debate was really only beginning. Even after usage had consecrated the *estatutos*, apologies defending, and denunciations attacking them continued to be written. The Inquisition prohibited all writings for or against the statutes in 1572, but this did not keep them from appearing. Toward the end of the sixteenth century it was generally recognized that a reform was needed, but the principle of purity of blood was so pervasive that there could be no agreement on what kind of changes should be undertaken. Felipe IV attempted a slight reform in 1623, limiting the number of investigations of the



same person to three and proscribing anonymous memorials and *libros verdes*, but his *pragmática* had little effect. What had started as a measure to defend the purity of the faith became inextricably interwoven with the Spanish concepts of nobility and honor and Spain was to suffer the consequences of its scruples at least until the nineteenth century, if not even today.

Such is the barest outline of the history of the controversy over purity of blood. Professor Sicroff fills it out by considering the most important writings both for and against the doctrine. In the hundred year period of adoption of anti-*converso* regulations the most notable documents in their favor were the statutes themselves, the *Fortalitium Fidei* of Alonso de Espina and the writings of Juan Martínez Silíceo, Archbishop of Toledo. (Mr. Sicroff stresses the plebeian background of Silíceo and the fact that the only claim to nobility he could make was that of being an "Old Christian.") Opposing the statutes were the *Defensorium Unitatis Christianae* of Cartagena, the *Lumen ad revelationem gentium* of Alonso de Oropesa and the appeals of the "New Christian" adversaries of Silíceo. After the adoption of a statute by the cathedral of Toledo, the opposition to it is represented by the denunciation of Domingo de Baltanás, an anonymous refutation by a Franciscan friar in 1581, and another from the first years of the seventeenth century. In defense of the statutes Diego de Simancas, under the pseudonym of Didacus Velásquez, produced a *Defensio Statuti Toletani* in 1575, and as much as a hundred years later Francisco de Torrejuncillo included a complete repertory of anti-Jewish legends in his *Centinela contra Judíos* and applied the name of *judío* to all, whether converted or not. In the debates on the question of reform, the foremost figures were the Franciscan Antonio de Córdoba who, although recognizing the validity of the statutes, did not believe that lineage could justify exclusion of "New Christians," and the Dominican Agustín Salucio who advocated a time limitation of the statutes. The most curious work of all is the *Defensa de los estatutos y noblezas españolas* of Fray Gerónimo de la Cruz (1637). Although he began by apparently refuting Salucio, de la Cruz's conclusions were not fundamentally different from those of the Dominican and he ended by petitioning the King to ban all distinctions between "Old" and "New Christians." But as Sicroff points out, the tortuous character of his book shows the impossibility of suppressing the "dogma" of purity of blood.

For the most part the author presents the substance of the docu-

ments, letters, decrees, etc., places the attacks and defenses in opposition to one another and allows them to speak for themselves. Both sides made use of the same biblical passages, church fathers and historical works to buttress their arguments. The result is a fascinating study of casuistry and of the reasons men can propound to justify their prejudices. Other than the documents themselves, Professor Sicroff draws most heavily on Henry Charles Lea, José Amador de los Ríos and Antonio Domínguez Ortiz. While it is not his purpose to refute anyone else, he does not hesitate to disagree with Luciano Serrano as to the significance of Cartagena's *Defensorium*, or with Américo Castro on the presumed Jewish ancestry of Alonso de Espina. Special mention should be made of his concluding chapter, "Quelques aspects de l'Espagne sous le régime des Statutes de Pureté de Sang," in which he considers (1) the effect on individuals, utilizing the correspondence between the Bishop of Cuzco and his nephew, Jacinto de la Vera, who wanted to join the Orden de San Juan, (2) the effect on a religious order such as the Jesuits, many of whose earliest members, including its second general, Diego Laínez, were "New Christians," (3) the relationship between *pureza de sangre* and the exaltation of the concept of nobility, both collective and individual, in the period and (4) the literary evidence of the preoccupation with unsullied lineage. Those interested primarily in Spain's literature will probably regret that Mr. Sicroff devotes less than three pages to this facet of the problem. But since his book is not basically concerned with creative writing, it would perhaps be more just to consider his suggestive conjectures about purity of blood in the Golden Age theatre as extra gifts, and to be grateful for their inclusion. As for the formal aspects of the book, it is almost completely free of typographical errors. (The few that I have noticed, on pp. 124, 143, 150, 191 and 300, are very minor in character.) The author has provided an adequate index of proper names and subject matter and an excellent bibliography of some 27 manuscript and 162 printed sources. The study is well documented throughout.

The Ohio State University

KENNETH R. SCHOLBERG

Ernest Hatch Wilkins, *Petrarch's Eight Years in Milan* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1958. xx + 266 pp. \$8.00. The Mediaeval Academy of America Publication No. 69). Ernest H. Wilkins, *Petrarch's Later Years* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1959. xiv + 322 pp. \$.40. The Mediaeval Academy of America Publication, 70). TO write a detailed critical review of two books such as these would not only be difficult, but perhaps foolhardy, if that meant taking issue over biographical data regarding Petrarch and his times with a scholar who has devoted all his life to Petrarch. At first glance the two books seem to contain extensive accounts of Petrarch's life from 1353 to his death. In effect, they are much more than this, for they do not focus so much on Petrarch the man, as on Petrarch the literary dictator of his day. We are not made to see simply the events that filled Petrarch's life, but the manner in which these events were directly or indirectly reflected in his works. In effect, the two books, if taken together with the chapter on "Petrarch in Provence, 1351-1353" appearing in Professor Wilkins' *Studies in the Life and Works of Petrarch* (1955), round off most effectively a truly intimate biography of Petrarch's last 23 years.

The two books are outstanding examples of success in the use of the historical method. In trying to reconstruct the most significant things that Petrarch saw, thought, said and wrote during the last twenty-one years of his life, Professor Wilkins leaves no stone unturned. Using Petrarch's letters as the fulcrum, Professor Wilkins turns to official historical documents of the time, correspondence of friends addressed either to Petrarch or to one another, individual works of Petrarch, studies by other scholars, and all possible notations left by Petrarch in such places as manuscript margins or flyleaves of his own books, in order to give an almost monthly account of Petrarch's political, domestic, intellectual and literary activities during the periods involved.

As stated in the Preface of the earlier book, it is primarily "an intimate biography of Petrarch" for which the author has attempted to utilize "all existing evidence as to his outer and inner experiences in this period, and to present them as exactly as possible in the order in which they entered into his life." To achieve a goal of such magnitude, however, the book was exposed to certain inevitable flaws in its form, especially in the matter of flow and continuity. But though a reader senses this as he works through the book, he also feels the truth of the author's statement, "... but life itself is discontinuous,

and the very frequency of the discontinuities that appear in this book may serve to illustrate the extraordinary variety of Petrarch's own experiences."

To attempt even a brief summary of these experiences would take this review far beyond necessary confines. But perhaps mention of the more significant or interesting ones would give some idea of the scope of the book. Chapter I, "Petrarch in Search of a Harbor," offers a penetrating study of the careful manner in which Petrarch decided to leave Avignon and Vaucluse for Italy and Milan. The discussion of how a city like Milan could have appeared as a suitable "harbor" to a man possessing Petrarch's obsession for tranquillity and solitude certainly provides a final solution for the riddle. Beginning with Chapter II we see Petrarch settling in Milan to begin his eight-year stay, and skillfully parrying the reproaches of his two circles of friends, one in Florence and one in Naples, over his choice of Milan. In Chapters III, IV and VI begins Petrarch's gradual but progressive involvement in affairs of state. Chapter VI also contains a full analysis of Petrarch's oration before the Ducal Council of Venice, on a mission organized by the Archbishop of Milan in an attempt to settle the dispute between Genoa and Venice. Chapter VIII contains an account of Petrarch's meeting with the Emperor in Milan in 1355, and Petrarch's bitter reaction to the Emperor's subsequent withdrawal from Italy. Petrarch's mission to Prague on behalf of the Visconti, who sought the aid of the Emperor, is described in Chapter XII.

In the second half of the book we see Petrarch receive the diploma of Count Palatine from the Emperor (XIV), expel his son from his home (XV), act as peace-maker among his friends (XVIII), entertain Boccaccio joyfully (XIX), turn to oral reading in order to determine appropriateness of versification and metre (XIX), help establish the study of Greek in Florence (XXII), compose his letter to Homer (XXII), deliver, in behalf of the Visconti, a carefully prepared oration before King John of France following the King's liberation from English captivity (XXIII), and act as consultant to the Emperor on the authenticity of an historical document (XXIV).

In the course of these activities, however, we observe Petrarch busily at work on his various works during the long night hours either in his house close to St. Ambrose or in some monastery or other temporary place of residence close to Milan where he would seek the necessary solitude. The next to the last chapter is devoted to those works of Petrarch that are of the Milanese period but cannot be assigned to

any particular year within that period. The final chapter gives a useful summary of Petrarch's life and work after leaving Milan just as Chapter I had been preceded by a section devoted to his life and works before going to Milan. There is also an Appendix containing a tabular view of the correspondence between Petrarch and Nelli from 1353-1360, a detailed "Index of Persons," and a very useful "Index of Works of Petrarch and of Extant Letters addressed to Him."

The second volume, like the first, opens with an Introductory Note listing the editions of Petrarch's works used in the work as well as other works and articles referred to in two or more chapters. It then proceeds to a detailed account of Petrarch's activities during the last thirteen years of his life when Padua and Venice began to offer greater appeal than Milan. Unlike the first volume, this one is divided into five books, each of the first four devoted to a change of residence, and the fifth to "Final Addenda." Among the more striking experiences that we see Petrarch undergoing during the early part of this period are: a long series of deaths, including friends and relatives, claimed either by the plague or other causes (*passim*), the decision to start his collection of *Seniles* (III), the offer and rejection of a papal secretaryship from Pope Innocent VI, and the interesting decision to settle in Venice.

Book II is devoted to Petrarch's residence in Venice. In it we witness Petrarch's improving relations with the Papacy following the election of Urban V (X), the many urgent invitations extended by both the Pope and the Emperor for extended visits (XI), the horrible ravages of the plague (XII), his participation in Venetian life (XIII), the composition of his last urgent plea for the Emperor's return to Italy (XIII), Petrarch's important role in Urban's decision to return to Rome (XV, XVI, XVIII), his exaltation at the Pope's short-lived return and reforms (XIX), and, finally, his painstaking work on the *Canzoniere* (XVI).

In Book III there are accounts of: another meeting of Petrarch with the Emperor, and his role as peace negotiator between the Emperor and Milan (XXI), the beginning of Petrarch's relationship with *Salutati* (XXII), and what is probably the correct explanation of why Petrarch resolved to leave Venice (XXI).

In Book IV we follow Petrarch to Arquà and his last residence which he had built to his own specifications. Here we see him write his Testament (XXVI), begin to lose his health (XXVII), intensify his work on the *Triumphs* (XXIX), write an increasing number of letters of recommendation (*passim*), establish a close relationship

with Francesco da Carrara (XXXI), staunchly defend Italy against a French detractor (XXXII), write a Treatise on princely government for Francesco da Carrara (XXXIII), give final touches to his *Canzoniere* and *Triumphs* (XXXIX-V), and write his letter to Posterity.

The final Book deals with unassignable letters of the period, an extremely enlightening account of the *De viris illustribus*, and the collection of *Seniles*. Like the first book, this one also ends with a valuable "Index of Works of Petrarch and of Extant Letters addressed to Him." Throughout the volume, however, what stands out most are Petrarch's relations with Boccaccio, his incredible European stature, the deep effect upon him of the relentless death of friends, and his unshaken dedication to his writings despite his involvements.

In affording valuable insights into Petrarch's most mature years, these two books settle an enormous number of questions or controversial matters. They assign new dates to previously misdated letters, present valuable bibliographical references on the identity of certain addressees, reconstruct lost letters sent or received by Petrarch, determine places of writing of various works or parts of works, indicate the most minute changes and interpolations in Petrarch's Italian verses, and recreate even Boccaccio's last visit.

Both books would probably have gained in clarity had it been possible to insert the discussions of the innumerable matters of controversy into the sections entitled "Addenda" that terminate most of the chapters. They would also have been more pleasantly readable had it been possible to avoid the various postponement of and back-references to discussions. But while these criticisms may apply in the case of the general reader, there is little doubt that for the reader who already has some knowledge of the life and works of Petrarch both books do achieve the author's ultimate goal as stated in the Preface of the earlier volume: the "hope that the reader may find pleasure in the intimate companionship with Petrarch that this book seeks to provide."

Harpur College

ALDO S. BERNARDO



## **Image and Meaning**

**Metaphoric Traditions in Renaissance Poetry**

**DON C. ALLEN**

**\$4.00**

"This extremely scholarly and beautifully styled work examines 8 widely known Elizabethan works." *Library Journal*

## **Pope's Epistle to Bathurst**

**A Critical Reading with an Edition of the Manuscripts**

**EARL WASSERMAN**

**\$7.50**

An immensely valuable analysis for students of the 18th century relating Pope to the stream of English literary, ethical and religious tradition.

## **Apollo and the Nine**

**A History of the Ode**

**CAROL MADDISON**

**\$6.50**

"An excellent and meticulous study of the classical origins and Renaissance developments of a literary form peculiarly enduring in Western literature." *Library Journal*

## **André Malraux**

**The Conquest of Dread**

**GERDA BLUMENTHAL**

**\$4.00**

"Valuable in understanding the significance of Malraux's work." *Library Journal*

order from your bookstore or

**The Johns Hopkins Press  
Baltimore 18, Maryland**

HARCOURT, BRACE & WORLD  
*announces its selection as the publisher of*  
*The National Defense Education Act*  
*Audio-Lingual Secondary-School Materials*  
*for Teaching French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish*  
*to appear under the title of*

## A-LM

**A-LM:** French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish — Levels One, Two, Three, and Four — comprise new and complete secondary-school programs of audio-lingual materials for modern foreign language instruction beginning in the seventh, eighth, or ninth grade. These materials, prepared by a group of language specialists from all parts of the country under contract with the Glastonbury, Connecticut, Public Schools, have been undergoing continuous testing and demonstration in representative schools throughout the nation, and in summer language institutes. Each A-LM program approaches a language through authentic speech exemplifying important structural patterns and providing the basis for the development of reading and writing skills. Each of the five language programs consists of student text materials, student take-home phonograph records, classroom or language-laboratory phonograph and tape recordings, and teacher's manuals.

*Level One — for all five languages —*  
*is scheduled to be ready for use in schools in September 1961.*

HARCOURT, BRACE & WORLD New York, Chicago, Atlanta, Dallas, Burlington